DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 331 527 IR 053 667

AUTHOR Nitecki, Joseph Z.

TITLE Selected Thematic Priorities in American Graduate Introductory Courses to Library and Information Science.

PUB DATE 90
NOTE 87p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; *Course Content; Curriculum Design; Educational Trends; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Information Science; Instructional Improvement; *Introductory Courses; Library Schools; *Library Science; Mail Surveys; Tables (Data); *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Canada; United States

ABSTRACT

A two-part questionnaire was mailed early in 1990 to all graduate schools of library and information science accredited by the American Library Association to solicit their views on the impact of the changing information environment on the content of introductory courses in the field. The first part focused on the administrative aspects of the introductory courses, and the second requested each respondent to prioritize a number of topics in a hypothetical syllabus for such a course on a four-part scale. This report is based on responses from the faculty responsible for introductory courses in 34 (56.6%) of the graduate library schools, all of which offered an introductory course. It was found that the course was required by all of these institutions, the lecture format was the most popular teaching method, and the focus of most programs was theoretical. Clear consensus was not found on the course content; in fact, the study provided some evidence of overall weak agreement among the profession's faculty. The overall concept of the profession emerged as a social institution concerned about its professional status and focusing primarily on issues of intellectual freedom, censorship, communication, and information policy. The predominant themes of the course were the philosophy, theory, and historical background of the discipline. This study seems to reinforce the perception of librarianship and information science as a discipline in transition. Seven appendixes include the survey questionnaire, a summary of responses from U.S. and Canadian libraries, and details of the analysis. (11 references) (BBM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED331527

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Selected Thematic Priorities in American Graduate Introductory Courses to Library and Information Science

by

Joseph Z. Nitecki

Professor Emeritus
State University of New York at Albany
School of Information Science and Policy

Please address all your correspondence to:

J.Z. Nitecki
22 Shetland Drive
Delmar, N.Y., 12054

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Z. Nitecki

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1990

IR 053 667

CONTENTS

- Abbreviations Used in the Report iii

I. Introduction 1

II. Scope of the Study 3

III. Preliminary Interpretation of Administrative Issues . 4
A. Terminology 4
1. Names of Institutions 4
2. Titles of Degrees Granted 5
B. Procedures and Policies Relating to:
1. Course Requirements 6
2. Course Title 7
3. Number of Instructors 7
4. Teaching Methodologies 8
5. Students Profile 9
6. Theory vs Practice 10
7. Course Evaluation 11
8. Revision of the Syllabus 11
12

IV. Analyzes of Priorities
A. Introductory Note 12
B. Distribution of Average Ratings (AR) 15
1. AR above 2 15
2. AR below 1 15
3. AR Distribution by Curricular Categories 16
4. US-Canadian AR Distribution 16
C. Relative Priorities (RP) 18
1. Arranged by Ratings (H,M,L,I) 18
2. Curricular Categories 18
3. Programatic Levels 21
D. Comparison of U.S. & Canadian Topical Preferences 21
24

V. Recapitulation.
1. Introduction 26
2. Average Ratings (AR) 30
3. Relative Priority (RP) 31
4. Comparison between U.S. and Canadian Rating Patterns 35
5. Summary & Conclusion 36

VI. Notes 37

VII. Selected Bibliography 38

VIII. List of Graduate Library Education Programs that Responded to the Survey Questionnaire 39

IX . Bulletins Received from the Participants 40

X. List of Tables 41

XI. Appendixes 42

Abbreviations Used in this Report

Ratings:

AR: Average Rating per Topics
RP: Relative Priority within Topics
H: High Rating
M: Medium Rating
L: Low Rating
i: Irrelevant Topics

Curricular Categories

A: Concepts
B: Information Content, Source & Services
C: Information Environment
D: Interdisciplinary Relations
E. Profession

Programmatic Levels:

L 1: Doctoral, Sixth Year Certificate and Master Degrees
L 2: Sixth Year Certificate and Master Degrees
L 3: Master Degrees Only

I. Introduction . 1

The significance of changing technologies in Library and Information Science is well documented, however, its impact on the professional schools' curricula is much less clear.

The purpose of this study was to identify the degree of concensus among the library and information science graduate schools on the definition of the field of library and information science as it is expressed by faculty preferences for topics to be included in the introductory courses.

The study is a part of continuing research in the foundations of the field. In a survey of faculty responsible for the development of a new doctoral program in one American university, wide spread opinions about the domain of the field were noted, with no clear agreement on the definitions of information or information science. The survey confirmed a widely held perception of information science as a complex, diversified and ecclectic field.(1)

An informal survey of the students taking an introductory course in the foundations of the field in the same institution indicated a strong student interest in the social and cultural background of librarianship (expressed by 96.5% of the students), and in the philosophical, scholarly and ethical aspects of library and information science (indicated by 82.8% of the students taking the same course) (2)

It is well known, that the foundation courses as presently offered are often disliked by students, who complain about lack of clarity, structure and balance between the theoretical and practical aspects of the course. The course is also difficult to conduct, because of such varying factors as student backgrounds, and stages when the course is taken (at the beginning or the end of the program), but perhaps most probably, because of a lack of concensus on the paradigms of the discipline itself.

In the present study some of the above issues are addressed, by asking the participants in the survey to rank the relative impor-tance of various topics that may be included in a hypothetical introductory course to the field. The study attempts to answer the following questions: What is the extend of agree ment on the selected topics suggested for a hypothetical intro ductory course to the field ? Is there any significant difference in the preferences expressed by the participants representing schools that offer doctoral programs, post-graduate certificates and Masters programs only ? How does the distribution of thematic priorities compare between American and Canadian faculty ? How important in the introductory course is the study of (a) con cepts, (b) informa-tion content, source and services, (c) information environment, (d) interdisciplinary relations and (e) professional aspects of the field ? And indirectly, how is the changing information technology reflected in administrative issues related to the management of the curriculum ?

II. Scope of the Study.

A survey questionnaire was mailed in the Spring of 1990 to all graduate library schools accredited by the ALA and listed in its October, 1989 leaflet (3). [see also Appendix 1]

Table 1: Distribution of Survey Questionnaire

PROGRAMS	United States			Canadian			Total Sample		
Levels:	S	R	A	S	R	A	S	R	A
Level 1:	20	13	11				20	13	11
Level 1a:	3			2	1	1	5	1	1
Level 2:	17	14	11				17	14	11
Level 3:	13	10	8	5	4	3	18	14	11
TOTAL	53	37	30	7	5	4	60	42	34

S: Number of questionnaires send
R: Number of questionnaires received
A: Number of questionnaires with data incorporated in the study
Level 1: Doctoral, Sixth Year Certificate and Masters programs
Level 1a: Doctoral and Masters programs [incorporated with L1]
Level 2: Sixth Year Certificate and Masters programs
Level 3: Masters programs only

A total of 42 questionnaires were returned (70% response); however 8 were received unanswered, thus reducing the size of the universe studied to 34 institutions (i.e., 56.6% of all accredited institutions). The reasons for not completing the questionnaires varied; five institutions indicated that they do not offer "such course", one institution stopped answering all questionnaires as a matter of policy, and one questionnaire had been reported lost in the mail and not replicated.

Although the overall response to the study was relatively weak, the data received represent a reasonably balanced picture among different programs; 55% of all institutions in level 1, 20 % in level 1a, 64.7% in level 2, and 61.1% in level 3 were analyzed in this study.

To protect confidentiality of participating institutions, data received from the small number of individual Canadian institu tions were analyzed, when appropriate, with similar U.S. programs, (doctoral granting institutions, L1).

Not all institutions answered all questions. Hence most of the comparisons in this study were based on average ratings for each topic (AR), or relative priorities (RP) within each topic.

The conclusions drawn from this study are of course limited by the scope and the format of the survey.

III. Preliminary Interpretation of Administrative Issues.

A. Terminology.

The ALA's list of Graduate Library Educational Programs offers some data of interst to this study, by providing names of institutions, and the levels of programs offered by each institution. These data imply a variation in the environment of school policies, which in turn, may have been a result of changing technology.

1. Names of the Institutions

Table 2. Variations in Names of Schools

Key Words in the Title	Canadian	U.S.	Total
Library, Archives, Information	1	0	1
Library and Information	6	35	41
Library Science/Service/School	0	9	9
Information and Library	0	3	3
Library and Information Management	0	1	1
Information (only)	0	3	3
Communication, Information, Library	0	1	1
Library and Technology	0	1	1

Fourty-seven institutions retained the words 'library' and 'information' in their titles (ie 78.4% of all accredited library schools); ten titles included 'library' excluding 'information', and three used the term 'information' without 'library'. This illustrates the partial adaptation among schools to the changing technology with only a few institutions eliminating all reference to the library in their titles.

2. Titles of Master Degrees Granted

Table 3: Variations in the Titles of Master Degrees Granted.

Degree	U.S.	Canadian
Master of Library Science	19	2
Master of Library Services	1	
Master of Science in Library Services	1	
Master of Science in Library Science	7	
Master of Librarianship	2	
Master of Science in Library and Information Science	3	1
Master of Library and Information Science	3	1
Master of Library and Information Studies	4	3
Master of Information and Library Studies	1	
Master of Arts in Library and Information Science	1	
Maitrise en bibliotheconomie et sciences de l'information		1
Master of Arts	9	
Master of Science	6	

The impact of changing technologies on the titles of degrees granted was less visible. Thirty-one institutions (51% of all accredited schools) retained the traditional names of degrees (which incorporate 'library' in the title) without the insertion of 'information'; 16 institutions (26.7%) used both 'library' and 'information', while the remaining 13 institutions used the terms 'library' and, or 'information' in various com binations. For example, although one dropped the word 'library' from its title, it still awards the 'Master of Library Science' degree. Five of the Canadian schools granted the MLIS degree (including one French equivalent), and two schools awarded the MLS degree.

B. Procedures and Policies Related to the Introductory Course

The first part of the survey asked questions related to the organization and administration of the introductory course.

1. Course Requirement

The course is required for graduation by all programs analyzed in this study. All but two U.S. institutions offered it as a three-hour credit course. Canadian institutions followed a different academic system.

2. Course title

Table 4:: Titles of Introductory Courses. Offered by U.S. & Canadian Schools

TITLE	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS
A. INFORMATION and LIBRARIES	11
- Library and Information Studies	
- Introduction to Library and Information Science	
- Introduction to Information and Library Studies	
- Introduction to Library and Information Studies	
- Foundations of Library and Information Science [3]	
- Foundations of Information and Library Science	
- Foundations of Library, Information and Media Programs	
- Fundamentals of Library and Information Science [2]	
[One school reported a second title: Information Science and Technology: Foundations]	
B. LIBRARIES & LIBRARIANSHIP	6
- Introduction to Library Science	
- Librarianship and the Structure of Libraries	
- Foundation of Librarianship [4]	
D. SOCIETY .	6
- Society Users and Libraries	
- Information & Society [3]	
- Library and Information in Society	
- Libraries, Information, Society	

E. INFORMATION 4
- Introduction to Information Science [3]
- Information Storage and Retrieval

F. INFORMATION PROFESSION 4
- Introduction to the Information Profession
- The Information Profession [2]
- Sciences et Professions de L'Information

G. INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT..... 3
- Information Environment
- Information Agencies and Their Environment
- Information Environment and Users

TOTAL 34

Titles of the introductory course also reflected the changing times. Half of all institutions incorporated both 'library' and 'information' into the course name, 11 institutions dropped 'library' and 6 institutions focused on the word 'society', by combining that term with either or both, 'information' and 'library'.

3. Number of Instructors Assigned to the Course.

Table 5:. Number of Instructors per Course

	Programatic Levels 1	2	3	TOTAL
1 instructor	3	2	5	10
2 instructors	5	3	3	11
3 instructors		4	1	5
4 instructors	1	1	2	4
5 instructors	1	1		2
Number varies	2			2
TOTAL	12	11	11	34

The total number of instructors were evenly divided among the three program levels (L1 ,L2 & L3). Two-thirds of the institu tions assigned the responsibilities for the course to one or two instructors). Three or four instructors were teaching in 26.5% of

institutions; only two institutions, both offering post graduate programs, assigned five instructors each. A total of 34 faculty members were responsible for the courses surveyed, not neces sarily all teaching every semester. The number of instructors, their philosophy of librarianship and subject specialization may of course, significantly influence students' perception of the field.

4. Teaching Methodologies

Table 6: Teaching Methods Used

Methods	Reported by institutions offering programs at levels 1	2	3	T O T A L S N	Percent
Lectures	9	11	11	31	91.2
Student Research	8	9	10	27	79.4
A-V Resources	8	8	7	23	67.6
Case Studies	5	6	2	13	38.2
Others	4	5	4	13	38.2
Team Teaching	4	1	3	8	23.5
Interactive Media	3	2	3	8	23.5
Simulation		2	1	3	8.8

Among the teaching methodologies used in all U.S. and Canadian programs, the most popular were lectures reported by 91.2% institutions, followed by the use of student research (79.4%) and A-V resources (67.6%), reported by 26 institutions.
The least popular methodology was simulation (reported by 3 institutions only). Minor variations were evident in team teach ing (used in doctoral programs twice as often as in any other level) and in the use of case studies (reported by only two institutions in level 3, as comnpared with 11 institutions in levels 1 and 2)

Not all institutions checked the 'lectures' column; some qualified their answers by comments such as 'sometimes' or 'shared by faculty and students'. The category 'others' included field trips, class discussions, seminars and guest lectures.

5. Students' Profile

Table 7: Percent of Beginning Graduate Students Registered in the Course

Percent	Reported by Institutions Offering the Course at Levels 1	2	3	T O T A L S N	Percent
100%	2		3	5	14.7
75-99%	5	2	2	9	26.5
50-74%	2	5	1	8	23.5
26-49%	2			2	5.9
25% or less		1	1	2	5.9
No Answer [or 'don't know]	1	3	4	8	23.5
TOTAL	12	11	11	34	

Many of students registered in the course were not the beginning graduate students for whom the course was initially designed; only five schools (14.7% of all schools, two of them U.S and three Canadian) reported that all their students begun the program with the introductory course. Twenty-six and a half percent of all institutions reported that 75-99% of their first semester graduate students registered in the course, followed by twenty-three and a half percent of institutions in which 50-74% of all students began the program with this course and slightly over eleven percent of institutions reported 25 to 50% of such students taking the course. (23.5% of the schools didn't know the percentage).

6. Theory vs Practice.

Table 8: Predominant Focus of the Course

FOCUS	Reported by Institutions Offering the Course at Levels 1	2	3	T O T A L S N	Percent
Theoretical	7	6	7	20	58.8
Practical			1	1	2.9
Mixed (50-50)	4	5	3	12	35.3
No Answer	1			1	2.9
TOTAL	12	11	11	34	

The emphasis of most programs (58.8%) was theoretical, fol lowed by a mixed (50-50) theoretical-practical focus (35.3%), only one school reported an entirely practical approach.

7. Course Evaluation

Table 9: Evaluation of the Course

Evaluated by	Reported by the Schools Offering the Programs at Curricular Levels 1	2	3	Total Evaluated	Percent Evaluated of the Total Sample
Faculty	7	5	8	20	58.8
Students	11	11	11	33	97.0
Peers	2	2	5	9	26.5
Administration	1	4	1	6	17.6

Most programs on all levels were evaluated by the students (97.0% institutions), followed by 20 institutions reporting faculty self-evaluation. In only 9 institutions the programs were reviewed by peers, and in 6 institutions by administration.

8. Revisions of the Syllabus

Table 10: Plans for Major Revision of the Course

Plans	Reported by Schools Offering Program at Levels 1	2	3	T O T A L S N	Percent
Will Review	2	3	4	9	26.5
Probably	1	2		3	8.8
Reviews Routinely or Recently	3	5	2	10	29.4
Will Not Review	5	1	2	8	23.5
May Drop			1	1	2.9
No Answer	1		2	3	8.8
TOTAL	12	11	11	34	99.9

Only eight schools (23.5%) will not review the course in the forseable future, 12 schools plan such a review, 10 schools review the course routinely, or reviewed it recently, 8 schools were satisfied with the present set up, and one school con templated dropping the course altogether. Clearly, schools do not yet fully agree on the concept and the content of the intro ductory course.

IV. Analyses of Priorities

A. Introductory Note

The main part of the questionnaire listed a series of topics that might be included in the hypothetical syllabus of an introductory course to library and information science. A total of 76 topics (ie individual questions in the survey) were divided into five categories, reflecting major divisions of the curricula: (A) concepts [10 topics], (B) information content, sources and services [32 topics], (C) information environment [12 topics], (D) interdisciplinary relations of the field [15 topics] and

(D) interdisciplinary relations of the field [15 topics] and issues related to the profession of Library and Information Science [7 topics]

These categories reflect the conceptual, procedural and contextual dimensions of the field. The conceptual cluster (A) refers to the discussions of the essence of the field, its philosophy, theory and disciplinary orientation. The procedural group of topics (B), relates to the content of the filed, its sources and services, i.e., the specific subdisciplines compris ing the field, as well as the types of institutions and patrons served. The contextual dimension of the field is subdivided into three components: the environment (C), the interdisciplinar nature of librarianship (D) and its professional aspects (E).

The list of topics included in the questionnaire, espe cially in the curricular categories B and D, is far from com plete. It does not specify some of the subjects that are universally recognized as basic in the field (eg reference serv ices are covered by a general topic 'public services'), or that are specialized (eg online services). None of such subjects were mentioned by any respondent in the columns: 'Others' provided for each section of the questionnaire. The purpose of the study was not to inventory all the subjects taught in the course, but to identify priorities of their major clusters.

The participants were asked to evaluate each topic in terms of its priority (high [h], medium [m], low [l] or irrelevant [i]) in an introductory course. It is assumed that the individual evaluations reflected the actual priorities given to these topics in the courses offered by the participating institutions. [see Appendix 1]

The analyses of the data obtained from the questionnaire are divided into two major evaluations (a) of the average ratings of each individual topic (AR) and (b) of the relative priorities within each topics (RP). Each group was further reviewed by examining the overall distribution of priorities (1) among the topics, (2) different programatic levels (L1, L2, L3) and (3) between the U.S. and Canadian institutions.

The concept of average rating (AR) was introduced to evaluate the relative importance of each topic among its multiple priorities. The average rating (AR) was calculated by dividing the sum of weighted priorities assigned to each topic (weights: 3 for 'high', 2 for 'medium', and 1 for 'low') by the total number of preferences recorded for each topic. The average rating allowed for a comparison of the consensus on the priorities of topics.

The concept of relative priority (RP) was designed to provide a means for comparing the extent of priorities assigned within each topic. This was obtained by calculating each of the priorities assigned by different respondents to the same topic as a percentage of all priorities assigned to that topic. The

relative priority value provided a basis for comparing the degree of internal concensus within each topic.

Although the data for the two measures (AR & RP) were the same, the differences in the order of priorities listed for average rating and relative priority reflected the degree of over all concensus on the importance of all topics.

Appendix 2 lists the topics in the order they appeared on the questionnaire with the cumulative answers. All the other tabulations are based on this appendix.

B. Distribution of Average Ratings (AR)

The topics with the largest number of cumulative responses are discussed here on two levels: (a) the topics arranged in the order of decreasing total number of preferences, both AR and RP, and (b) the topics given highest priority within each of the five curricular ategories. (see Appendix 3)

1. AR above 2

Sixteen topics were graded above the average rating of AR 2:

A-1: Definitions of Basic Concepts [AR:2.73]
E-1: Concept of Profession [AR:2.56]
A-2b: Philosophy of Library Science [AR:2.52]
A-4d: Sociological Aspects (Society and Culture) [AR:2.50]
E-6: Professional Ethics [AR:2.43]
C-8: Intellectual Freedom [AR:2.35]
A-3b: Theory of Library Science [AR:2.33]
E-4: Library and Information Agencies [AR:2.33]
C-1: Censorship [AR:2.32]
C-2: Communication [AR:2.32]
E-5: Professional Organizations [AR:2.25]
C-3: Control of Information (Copyrights,etc) [AR:2.12]
C-6: Historical Background [AR:2.12]
A-2a: Philosophy of Information Science [AR:2.03]
C-7: Information Policy [AR:2.03]
A-4b: Historical Aspects (Evolving Concepts) [AR:2.23]

2. AR below 1

Sixteen topics were given the lowest average rating of less than AR=1, (all in the curricular categories of B: informnation content, sources & services, and in D: the interdisciplinary relations). The four topics at the bottom of that list were:

D-1: Anthropology [AR:0.63]
D-8: Mathematics [AR:0.62]
D-13: Semiotics [AR:0.48]
D-9 Neurology [AR:0.4]

3. AR Distribution by Curricular Categories

Arrangement of topics by curricular categories provided an illustration of the relative importance of each dimension of the field: (see: Appendix 4)

- Concepts (A):

Six topics were rated above AR=2: the five listed above (A1, A2b,A4d,A3b,A4b)) and philosophy of information science (A-2a) The remaining four topics were all above AR=1:

A-4c: Psychological Aspects (Information Users) [AR:1.88]
A-3a: Theory of Information Science [AR:1.87]
A-4a: Economics of Information [AR1.79]
A-4e: Technical Aspects (know-how) [AR:1.52]

- Information Content, Sources & Services (B):

None were rated above AR=2. Twenty-seven topics were in the range from AR=1.89 (B-25:Technology) to AR=1 (B-24: Technical Services). Five topics were listed below AR=1:

B-2: Artificial Intelligence (AR:0.97)
B-7 Bibliographic Instruction (AR:0.91)
B-5: Cataloging (AR:0.83)
B-6: Classification (AR:0.82)
B-21: Rare Material (AR:0.81)

- Information Environment (C):

Six topics were rated above AR=2, all included in the sixteen high ranked topics listed above. The other six were all above AR=1:

C-5: Environmental Factors [AR=1.94]
C-11: Research [AR=1.79]
C-4b: Mass Media [AR=1.76]
C-9: Legislation [AR=1.76]
C-4a: Popular Culture [AR=1.68]
C-10: Organizational Structure [AR=1.67]

- Interdisciplinary Relations (D):

This category received the overall lowest rating, with only four topics rated above AR=1:

D-3: Communication [AR=1.26]
D-4: Computer Science [AR=1.16]
D-5: Economics [AR=1.1]
D-6: Education [AR=1.3]

Eleven topics were all below AR=1: the lowest three were:

D-8: Mathematics [AR=0.62]
D-13: Semiotics [AR=0.48]
D-9: Neurology [AR=0.4]

- Profession (E):

Four topics with the highest AR were also listed among the sixteen highest rated topics; the remaining three were rated as follows:

E-7: Specialization [AR=1.9]
E-2: Educational programs [AR=1.84]
E-3: Labor Relations [AR=1.5]

4. Distribution of AR Ratings among U.S. and Canadian Institutions.

The highest AR rating was distributed by the two countries as follow:

		US	Canada
E-1	Concept of Profession	1(2.57)	1a(2.5)
A-1:	Definitions of Basic Concepts	2(2.53)	1b(2.5)
A-4d:	Sociological Aspects	2(2.5)	1c(2.5)
A-2b:	Philosophy of Library Science	4(2.48)	1d(2.5)
E-6:	Professional Ethics	5(2.42)	1e(2.5)
A-2a:	Philosophy of Information Science	6a(2.4)	4a(2.0)
C-2:	Communication	6b(2.4)	4b(2.0):

Grouping of preferences by Canadians was very concentrated; the second highest AR rating of AR=2 was given to nine topics, with a group of twenty-two topics given an AR between 2.33 and 2.0; and only four topics were rated below AR=1 as compared with sixteen topics so rated by the U.S. schools.

Hence, the more significant differences between the two countries are the different ranks of the similar priorities given to the topics professional ethics and philosophy of library science

C. Relative Priorities (RP)

1. Arranged by Rating (H,M,L,I)

The percentile distribution of relative priorities (RP) among the topics listed in the questionnaire was analyzed on four levels: (a) priorities designated as high, medium, low and irrelevant, (b) distribution of prioriries by curricular categories of activity (A,B,C,D,E) (c) different programs

offered by the institutions (Levels 1,2 and 3), and (d) a comparison of topical priorities by U.S. and Canadian institutions. (see Appendix 5)

Each of the high to irrelevant priorities was listed as a percentile of the total response to particular questions.

a. High Priorities.

Sixty-six participants considered some topics as high priority. Of these eight topics were so designated by over fifty percent of all participants:

A-1: Defintion of Basic Concepts [76.6%]
E-1: Concept of Profession [[61.8%]
A-2b: Philosophy of Library Science [58.0%]
E-6: Professional Ethics [57.4%]
A-4d: Sociological Aspects (Society & Culture) [55.9%]
C-8: Intellectual Freedom [52.9%]
A-3B: Theory of Library Science [50.0%]
C1: Censorship [50.0%]

All of these topics were listed in almost the same order as the highest average priorities (see A-1a above). Ten topics were not rated (B-1,B-2,B-19,D-1,D-2,D-8,D-9,D-12,D-13,D-15).

b. Medium priority. All seventy-six topics were considered medium priority by some respondents, eight of them by over 50 per cent of the participants;

C-5: Environmental Factors [64.5%]
C-3: Control of Information (copyrights,etc) [58.8%]
C-4b: Mass Media [57.6%]
A-4b: Historical Aspects (evolving concepts) [52.9%]
C-7: Information Policy [52.9%]
C-9: Legislation [52.9%]
B-25: Technology [51.9%]
A-4c: Technical Aspects (know-how) [50.0%]

Three topics were considered medium priority by less than 1% of the participants [B-21,D-1,D-9]

The order of medium rank preferences have departed from the average prioritizing; for example, only three of the top eight medium priorities were given AR's average rating of over 2 [C-3, A-4b,C-7], suggesting that a significant number of other participants, although in a minority, did not agree with this designation of priorities.

c. Seventy-five ratings were given to topics classified as low priority, seven of them by over 50% of the participants:

B-1: Archives [69.7%]
B-12: Government Publications [64.5%]
B-2: Artificial Intelligence [53.1%]
B-24: Technical Services [51.7%]
B-21: Rare Material [51.6%]
B-6: Classification [50.0%]
D-1: Anthropology [50%]

Less than one percent of rating for low priority were given to seven topics, most of them also receiving highest rating for high priority (A-2b,E-6,E-4,E-5,C-5,A-4d,A-1). One topic was not rated [E-1]

d. Sixty-Seven percent of all topics listed in the question naire were rated by some institutions as irrelevant. Three of the topics were so considered by over 50 % of the participants:

D-9: Neurology [63.3%]
D-13: Semiotics [62.1%]
D-8: Mathematics [50.0%]

No institution considered the following seven topics as irrelevant:: A-1,A-2a,A-2b,A-3b,A-4b,A-4d,B-3,C-2,C-3.

2. Curricular categories.

The largest percentage of participants rated different categories of activities as follow:

The rating of high priority was largest for concepts and profession, followed by information environment, information content, sources & services, with the smallest number of such ratings given to interdisciplinary relations. (Appendix 5b)

The medium priority was predominant in information environment followed by concepts, information content, sources & services, profession, and finally interdisciplinary relations.

The low priority was most frequently assigned to information content, sources & services, followed by interdisciplinary relations, concepts, information environment and profession.

The irrelevant priority was most often designated for interdisciplinary relations, followed by information content, sources and services, information environment, profession, and concepts.

3. Programatic levels (see Appendixes 6-6a)

Relative priority ratings were distributed among different programatic levels as follow:

Highest Percent Rating for	PhD + Certificate + Masters Degree (L1)	Certificate + Master Degree (L2)	Masters Degree Only (L3)
Highest RP Topics	100% A-1	81.1% A-2b	75.0% A-1,A-4d,E-1
Medium RP Topics	72.7% A-4a,C-3,C-5	81.8% C-4b	62.5% B-19
Lowest RP Topics	91.0% B-1	72.7% B-2	85.7% D-1
Irrelevant RP Topics	63.6% B-24,D-14,E-3	88.9% D-1,D-9,D-13	85.7% B-5

The topics listed among the highest six in each priority showed some discrepency among the programs.

TOPIC	LISTED BY:
HIGH PRIORITY	
A-1: Definition of Basic Concepts	all three levels
A-4d: Sociological Aspects	all three levels
E-6: Professional Ethics	all three levels
A-2b: Philosophy of Library Science	Levels 1 & 2
C-2: Communication	Levels 1 & 2
C-8: Intellectual Freedom	Levels 2 & 3
E-1: Concept of Profession	Levels 2 & 3
E-5: Professional Organizations	Levels 2 & 3
E-4: Library & Information Agencies	Levels 1 & 3
A-3a: Theory of Information Science	Level 1 only
A-3b: Theory of Library Science	Level 1 only
E-3: Labor Relations	Level 2 only
E-7: Specialization	Level 1 only

MEDIUM PRIORITY

- No single topic was given medium priority in all three levels

Topic:	Shared by:
A-4a: Economics of Information	Levels 1 & 3
B-3: Automation	Levels 1 & 3
C-3: Control of Information	Levels 1 & 2
C-5: Environmental Factors	Levels ! & 2
A-2a: Philosophy of Information Science	Level 3 only
B-22a:College & University Libraries	Level 1 only
B-25: Technology	Level 3 only
C-4b: Mass Media	Level 2 only
E-4: Library & Information Agencies	Level 2 only
E-7: Specialization	Level 2 only.

LOW PRIORITY

- No single topic was given low priority by all three levels

Topic	Shared by
B-1: Archives	Levels 1 & 2
B-12: Government Publications	Levels 1 & 2
A-3a: Theory of Information Science	Level 3 only
A-4a: Economics of Information	Level 2 only
B-5: Cataloging	Level 1 only
B-6: Classification	Level 1 only
B-7: Bibliographic Instruction	Level 1 only
B-9: Expert Systems	Level 3 only
B-16: Personnel	Level 3 only
B-21: Rare Material	Level 1 only
B-23: Public Libraries	Level 3 only
B-23c:Elderly Library Users	Level 2 only
B-24: Technical Services	Level 2 only
D-1: Anthropology	Level 3 only
D-4: Computer Science	Level 4 only

Irrelevant Topics

- No single topic was given irrelevant ratings by all three levels

Topic	Shared by
D-1: Anthropology	Levels 1 & 2
D-8 Mathematics	Levels 1 & 2
D-9: Neurology	Levels 1 & 2
D-13: Semiotics	Levels 1 & 2
B-4: Bibliography	Level 3 only
B-5: Cataloging	Level 3 only
B-6: Classification	Level 3 only
B-16: Personnel	Level 1 only
B-23c:Elerly Library Users	Level 3 only
B-23d:Business Library Users	Level 3 only
D-6: Education	Level 3 only
D-7: Linguistics	Level 2 only
D-12: Public Administration	Level 1 only

D. Comparison of U.S. and Canadian Topical Preferences

The distribution of eleven most frequent responses for high priorities assigned by all U.S. and all Canadian institutions was as follow: (see Appendexes 7-7a)

TOPIC	Priority Rank and Percent Assigned by U.S	Canada
HIGH PRIORITY		
A-1: Definitions of Basic Concepts	1(73.1%)	1a(50.0%)
A-2a: Philosophy of Information Science	2(50.0%)	14(34.6%)
A-2b: Philosophy of Library Science	3(59.3%)	1b(50.%)
A-3a: Theory of Information Science	17(25.9%)	1c(50.0%)
A-4a: Economics of Information	33(13.8%)	1d(50.0%)
A-4d: Sociological Aspects	5(56.7%)	1e(50.0%)
C-1: Censorship	7(50.0%)	1f(50.0%)
C-2: Communication	8(50.0%)	18(25.0%)
C-7: Information Policy	20(23.3%)	1g(50.0%)
C-8: Intellectual Freedom	6(50.0%)	1h(50.0%)
E-1: Concept of Profession	2(63.3%)	1i(50.0%)

As shown, above half of all institutions in each country assigned high priority to two topics (C-1 and C-8), they differed markedly in 5 cases (A-2a,A-3a,A-4a,C-2,C-7)

MEDIUM PRIORITY

Topic	U.S.	Canada
C-5: Environmental Factors	1(64.2%)	3a(64.2%)
C-3: Control of Information	2(56.7%)	2a(75.0%)
C-7: Information Policy	3(53.3%)	4a(50.0%)
A-4a: Economics of Information	4(51.7%)	5a(25.0%)
A-4c: Psychological Aspects	5a(50.0%)	2b(50.0%)
B-03: Automation	5b(50.0%)	4b(33.3%)
B-25 Technology	5c(50.0%)	
1a(100.0%)		
C-4b: Mass Media	5d(50.0%)	
1b(100.0%)		
A-4b: Historical Aspects	6a(46.7%)	
1c(100.0%)		
B-11: Information Retrieval	14(37.9%)	1c(100.0%)
B-13: Management of Information	8c(43.3%)	1d(100.0%)
B-15: Networks	15b(36.7%)	
1e(100.o%)		
B-16: Personnel	35b(14.3%)	
1f(100.0%)		
B-18: Public Services	18b(33.3%)	
1g(100.0%)		
B-20: Preservation & Conservation	26(24.1)	1h(100.0%)
C-6: Historical Background	10(41.4%)	1i(100.0%)

In this priority level, a number of topics, especially by Canadian institutions, were given the same rating, e.g., Canadians identified ten topics as 100% medium priority, six as 75%, five as 66.6% and 33 topics as 50 percent medium priority. Similar clusters among U.S. institutions were less frequent, with only three topics given 50% medium priority, other clusters appearing at lower percentiles.

LOW PRIORITY

Topic	U.S.	Canada
B-1: Archives	1(70.0%)	2(66.6%)
B-12: Government Publications	2(65.5%)	3a(50.0%)
B-2: Artificial Intelligence	3(53.3%)	3b(50.0%)
B-24: Technical Services	4(51.8)	3c(50.0%)
B-21: Rare Materials	5(51.7%)	3d(50.0%)
B-6: Classification	6a(50.0%)	Noresponse
B-16: Personnel	6b(50.0%)	Noresponse
B-23b:Young Adults	15a(40.7%)	2(40.7%)
D-1: Anthropology	8(48.1%)	3e(66.7%)
B-3: Automation	19(33.3%)	3f(66.6%)
B-23c:Elderly Library Users	11(44.4%)	3g(66.7%)
B-23d:Business Library users	23(29.6%)	3h(66.7%)
B-10: Formats of Information	63a(20.0%)	1(100.0%)

Fourteen other topics were rated by 50% of Canadian institutions as low priority; other groupings in both countries were in lower percentiles of the rating.

IRRELEVANT TOPICS

Nine U.S. and fifty-seven Canadian institutions did not assign any topic to this category. The six highest 'irrelevant' ratings were:

Topic	U.S.	Canada
D-13: Semiotics	1(65.4%)	3a(33.3%)
D-9: Neurology	2(66.6%)	1(62.9%)
D-14: Statistics	3a(51.9%)	4a(25.0%)
D-8: Mathematics	3b(51.9%)	3b(33.3%)
D-7: Linguistics	4a(25.0%)	4b(25.0%)
B-2 Artificial intelligence	18a(23.3%)	2a(50.0%)

The only clear concensus between U.S. and Canadian institutions among the highest ratings in this group was for mathematics and linguistics, with the largest discrepency on the irrelevance shown for artificial intelligence.

V. Recapitulation

1. Introduction

To understamd better the impact of the changing information environment on the content of introductory courses to library and information science, a survey was conducted early in 1990 by soliciting views from the participating library schools . A questionnaire sent to all ALA accredited library schools was divided into two parts, first, asking questions related to the administrative aspects of the introductory courses, the sec ond part requesting each participant to prioritize a number of topics in a hypothetical syllabus for such a course on a scale from high, medium, low to irrelevant priority. The topics were clustered around five subgroups, each dealing with different aspect of the field: (1) 'Concepts' covering philosophy, theory and major subject focused on library and information science, (2) 'Information content, sources and services' addressed procedural aspects of the field, (3) 'Information environment' dealt with social and cultural issues, (4) 'Interdisciplinary relations' listed a number of disciplines that may impact on the field, and (5) 'Profession' included work-related aspects of librarianship.

The analysis of the survey was threefold. First, a quick look at the names of the accredited library schools and the titles of the master degrees granted by them, suggested an adaptation to the changing information technologies but with considerable retention of a traditional viewpoint. Forty-six institutions incorporated the words 'library and information' in their title,

only three schools used the word 'information' without reference to 'library'. Similarily, the master degrees granted by each institution contained the word 'library' (or its French equi valent in one Canadian library school) even in the schools which dropped the word 'library' from their official name.

The review of the administrative part of the survey suggested the following pattern. The introductory course was required by all institutions, the number of instructors teaching it varied from one to five, with one or two instructors per course indi cated as the most frequent arangement. The most popular teaching methodology was still a lecture format, with simulation reported only by three institutions.

Only two U.S. and all Canadian institutions reported that all students took this course in the first semester of their graduate work. The focus of most programs was theoretical, only one school reported an entirely practical approach. Programs in all schools were evaluated by the students, many schools also had peer reviews. Most schools either recently reviewed the course syllabus or contemplated such a review in the near future. Only eight institutions would not review the program, and one school contemplated dropping the course altogether. Five institutions responding to the questionnaire reported that they did not offer such a course, and were excluded from this review.

Although the analysis of the answers to the questionnaire suggested an emerging pattern, the conclusions were based on a relatively small number of respondents (thirty-four) and on an unavoidable bias of the questionnaire itself in the selection and arrangement of the survey questions. Hence what follows should be read with these limitations in mind.

The review of the ratings of topics was made on two levels. (1) In order to establish the overall importance of all topics as reported by the participants as a whole, an 'average rating' (AR) was calculated by multiplying each rating by '3' for 'high'priority,, by '2' for 'medium', and by '1' for 'low' priority, then dividing the sum of the total answers given to each question by the number of votes for it. (2) To understand better the relative importance of the ratings within each topic a 'relative priority' (RP) was obtained by recalculating ratings for each topics into percents of total votes given for that topic. The extent of the concensus on the value of each topic was then analyzed by examining (a) the U.S. and Canadian ratings for each topic, (b) the responses by major curricular categories, (c) the ratings by schools offering different programs, and finally, (d) the U.S. and Canadian patterns of prioritizing.

The survey identified a partial concensus, (in the range of 76 to 50 percent) on clusters of topics, whose ratings were repeated with some variations among different curricular categories. However, the order of the topics did vary, indicating the dif-

ferences in the concensus among 'medium', and 'low' ratings. The differences in the range of preferences were more pronounced by examining the extreme ratings of 'high' and 'irrelevant' priorities, since that disparity related more directly to the general perception of the paradigm of the field. For example, although twenty-three respondents selected ' definitions of basic concepts' as the high priority topics, six institutions rated it as a 'medium' and one as a 'low' priority, none as 'irrelevant'. 'Professional ethics' was ranked as 'high' priority by 19.5 institutions (half a point indicated a split rating),10.5 institutions considered it a 'medium' priority, three a 'low' and one an 'irrelevant' topic for the inclusison in the library and information science introductory course.

Topics given highest preferences reflected traditional emphaseson libraries with added interest in information. The overall concept of the profession emerged as a social institu tion, concerned about its professional status and focusing primarily on issues of intellectual freedom, censorship, com munication and information policy, in that order of priority. The predominant themes of the course were the philosophy, theory and historical background of the discipline. The survey revealed a somewhat surprisingly lower interest in interdisciplinary issues in spite of their contemporary impact on the field (e.g. statistics was rated as one of the lowest AR's).

2.. The Average Ratings (AR)

The average priorities of the topics (AR) can be summmarized as follow:

Sixteen topics were considered by most to be a high priority, rated above the AR=2 (out of a maximum AR=3), and sixteen were rated as low by most (below the AR =1)::

a. Sixteen topics graded above the average rating of AR=2:

A-1: Definitions of Basic Concepts [AR:2.73]
E-1: Concept of Profession [AR:2.56]
A-2b: Philosophy of Library Science [AR:2.52]
A-4d: Sociological Aspects (Society & Culture) [AR:2.50]
E-6: Professional Ethics [AR:2.43]
C-8: Intellectual Freedom [AR:2.35]
A-3b: Theory of Library Science [AR:2.33]
E-4: Library and Information Agencies [AR:2.33]
C-1: Censorship [AR:2.32]
C-2: Communication [AR:2.32]
E-5: Professional Organizations [AR:2.25]
C-3: Control of Information (Copyrights,etc) [AR:2.12]
C-6: Historical background [AR:2.12]
A-2a: Philosophy of Information Science [AR:2.03]
C-7: Information Policy [AR:2.03]
A-4b: Historical Aspects (Evolving Concepts) [AR:2.23]

b. Sixteen topics were given the lowest average rating of less than AR=1. The four topics at the bottom of that list were:

D-1: Anthropology [AR:0.63]
D-8: Mathematics [AR:0.62]
D-13: Semiotics [AR:0.48]
D-9: Neurology [AR:0.4]

c. The most important topics (high AR) were in the 'concept' category (six of these topics were rated above AR=2), followed jointly by 'information enmvironment' (also listing six topics above AR=2), and 'profession' (with four topics above AR=2, but receiving larger number of ratings as 'medium' priority).

d. None of the topics in 'information content, sources & serv ices' had AR=2 rating, five topics were rated below AR=1. The group 'interdisciplinary relations' was given the lowest rating, with only four topics above, and eleven below AR=1 (the lowest rated four topics were: D-1, D-8, D-9, D-13, all listed above).

3. Relative Priority (RP)

Arrangement of the answers to the questionnaire by relative priority (RP) allowed for a closer examination of discrepencies among the ratings within each topic.

a. Sixty-three participants considered some topics as high priority. Over half of all the ratings given to each of eight of the topics were high prioririty. This order closely corresponded to the AR listing above, indicating some concensus on the highest priority topics.

b. A medium priority rating was assigned to all seventy-six topics of the questionnaire. The eight topics most frequently rated as medium priority were the following:

C-5: Environmental Factors [64.5%]
C-3: Control of Information (copyrights,etc) [58.8%]
C-4b: Mass Media [57.6%]
A-4b: Historical Aspects (evolving concepts) [52.9%]
C-7: Information Policy [52.9%]
C-9: Legislation [52.9%]
B-25: Technology [51.9%]
A-4c: Technical Aspects (know-how) [50.0%]

Three of these topics, A-4b, C-3,C-7, were also given an above AR=2 rating, while A-2A and C-6, although rated above AR=2, were lower in the medium ratings; (C-6 was the sixth, and A-2A the fourty-six on the average rating (AR) list).

c. Seventy-five topics were included in the 'low' priority list (topic 'concept' and 'profession' were not rated low by anyone). Seven topics with the highest low priority, given by over fifty percent of all respondends were:

B-1: Archives [69.7%]
B-12: Government Publications [64.5%]
B-2: Artificial Intelligence [ ]
B-24: Technical Services [51.7%]
B-21: Rare Material [51.6%]
B-6: Classification [50.0%]
D-1: Anthropology [50%]

Four of these ratings (B-2,B-6,B-21, and D-1) were below AR=1, with 'anthropology' (D-1) listed with the fourth lowest AR , a topic clearly considered by the group as close to irrelevant.

d. Sixty-seven topics were ranked 'irrelevant'. The most frequent 'irrelevant' rating was given to:

D-9: Neurology [63.3%]
D-13: Semiotics [62.1%]
D-8: Mathematics [50.0%]

Two of these topics were also the lowest on the AR list, thus indicating a good concensus about the most 'irrelevant' topics. Seven topics: A-1, A-2a. A-2b, A-4b, B-3, C-2, and C-3 were not rated 'irrelevant' by any institution.

e. Prioritizing by Curricular Categories.

Most of the 'high' priorities were given to topics in the 'concept and 'profession' curricular categories, combining the theoretical with pragmatic concerns of the field. The largest number of 'medium' priority ratings went to topics in the information environment, reflecting expanded interest in the information. The 'information content, sources & services' had the highest number of 'low' priority topics. The 'irrelevant' rating was most frequently assigned to the interdisciplinary relations, ignoring, or at least not stressing the increasingly inclusive nature of information, and perhaps indirectly illustrating the isolationism of the library faculty from other disciplines.

f. Prioritization By Programs

A comparison of rating patterns among the institutions offering different levels of graduate programs was more revealing when inclusions and exclusions of specific topics were examined. At all three levels: the doctoral (L1), postgraduate (L2), and masters only programs (L3) , 'definitions of basic concepts', 'sociological aspects' and 'professional ethics' were considered 'high' priority. There were no single topics among 'medium',

'low' or 'irrelevant' categories that would share the similar ranking by all three levels. The topics rated exclusively high by of the programs only suggested the differences between these programs.

Among doctoral programs (L1): the major focus was on the theory of the field and on specialization. They shared with level 2 programs high priority rankings for the philosophy of library science and communication of ideas, and with level 3, the importance of professional organizations and agencies. This level had also rated as medium priority the 'College & university types of libraries', considering as low priority the 'cataloging and classification'. It was the only level that considered 'personnel' and 'public administration' irrelevant.

Post-graduate certificate programs (L2): singled out 'labor relations' as high priority, 'mass media' and 'information agencies' as medium priority; economics, services to elderly users, technical services as low priorities; and linguistics as irrelevant.

Programs offering only Master degrees shared with post-graduate certificate programs high priority preferences for intellectual freedom. profession, and organization, and with doctoral programs, philosophy and communication. In this level, philosophy of information science & technology were singled out as the highest medium priority, while theory of information science, expert systems, personnel and public librarieswere con

sidered low priority. Bibliography, cataloging, classification, elderly and business library users were seen as irrelevant topics at this level of evaluation.

4. Comparison between U.S. and Canadian Rating Patterns.

Results of extensive comparisons of priorities among the U.S. and Canadian institutions may be questioned because a very small Canadian sample exagerated the differences in distribution of ranking. With this limitation in mind, some concensus in assigning top priorities could be inferred.

Half of all institutions in both countries asssigned high priority to two topics: censorship (C-1) and intellectual free dom. Among the five high priority topics assigned by the U.S. institutions, two were rated much lower by the Canadian schools: philosophy of information science (34.6% vs U.S. 50%) and communication (25% vs US. 50%). Among the nine high priority topics assigned by the Canadian institutions, three were rated much lower by U.S. schools: theory of information science, economics of information and information policy.

A concensus is less evident among ten topics considered to be of medium priority by the Canadians, but the levels of priority given to the same ten topics by the U.S. schools were much more scattered. The topic which most U.S. schools considered to be of medium priority was environmental factors.

Comparison of topics listed as low priority was even more difficult. Twenty-one topics were given a low priority by over

fifty percent of all Canadian participants, while only seven of these topics were so rated by half of the U.S. institutions.

Schools in the two countries also differed in their listing of the most irrelevant topics for the introductory course. The Canadians listed only eighteen such topics, each identified by only one participant, except for neurology which was selected by two of the three voting institutions. The U.S. identified sixty-three irrelevant topics; the most often cited irrelevant topics were neurology, mathematics ,and statistics.

5. Summary and conclusion.

The purpose of this study was to search for an agreement among the library and information science faculty on the definition of the field as it is projected by the content of its introductory course. Clear conensus has not been found. On the contrary, the study provided some evidence of overall weak agreement among the profession's faculty. The highest level of concensus was expressed by about 70% of the responding faculty to identify only one topic as a high priority. Agreement on the importance of a few other topics was reached by only 60% of the respondents. But the rating of the majority of topics was scattered throughout the whole range of priorities.

In retrospect, this study, although limited in scope and nar row in focus, seems to reinforce the perception of librarianship and information science as a discipline in transition. There are today many new claims made on its territory, but as yet very few

attempts to interpret, in new terms, the field's heritage of selecting, organizing and facilitating the use of the society's cultural records. But after all, the concensus is not imposed or planned; it emerges from a discipline's philosophical maturation.

NOTES.

1. Nitecki, Joseph Z. Survey of Common Bibliographic Denominators Among Disciplines Participating in SUNY-Albany Ph.D. Program in Information Science, rev. 1989. Cited in the July 1990 issue of the journal Resources in Education [Identification number: ED 316072]

2. An informal survey of students enrolled in an introductory course, 'Information Environment' at SUNY-Albany School of Information Science and Policy, conducted by the author in the Spring Semester 1990.

3. ALA/ACOLA. Graduate Library Education Programs, October 1989

VII. Selected Bibliography

- Allen, Waler C. and F. Wilfrid Lancaster. A Directed Independent Study Approach to a Foundations Course. Journal of Education for Librarianship.21(4), 313-326, Spring 1981

- Anderson, A.J. The Introductory Course: A New Approach.Journal of Education for Librarianship 11(3) Winter, 261-269

- Comaromi, John P., and Robert M. Ballard. The Relevance of the Core Curriculum in Preparation of Library School Students for Professional Library Duties. ERIC ED 1422350 1974, 17 p.

- Curran, Charles. The University of South Carolina Core Curriculum. Journal of Education for Librarianship, 19(2), 172-178, Fall 1978

- Goodlad, John I. A New Look at an Old Idea: Core Curriculum. Educational Leadership, 44(4), Dec-Jan., 1986-87, 8-16. Also ERIC ED EJ347084 1987

- Oller, A. Kathryn. Drexel's Experience with the Integrated Core. Journal of Education for Librarianship, 19(2), Fall 1978, 167-71

- Preer, Jean L. Rebuilding Foundations. Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 28(1), Summer 1987, 58-61

- Roper, Fred W. The Integrated Core Curriculum: The University of
North Carolina Experience. Journal of Education for Librar ianship, 19(2) Fall 1978, 159-66

- Sable, M.H. Outline of the Introductory Course in International and Comparative Librarianship.International Library Review, 2(2) April 1970, 187-192.

- Saunders, W.L. Curriculum Development: The Core--Common Trunk or Satelites. International Federation of Library Associations. The Hague, 1987 ,

- Tripp, David H., and Watt, A.John. Core Curriculum: What It Is and Why We Don't Need One.Journal of Curriculum Development, 16(2), April-June 1984, 131-141

VIII. List of Graduate Library Education Programs that Responding to thethe Survey Questionnaire

- The author expresses sincere thanks to the deans, directors and individual faculty participants for their contributions and apologize for overburdenning them with still another survey questionnaire.

UNITED STATES

University of Arizona
Brigham Young University
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Los Angeles
Catholic University of America
Clarion University of Pennsylvania
Columbia University
Emporia State University
University of Hawaii
University of Illinois
Indiana University
University of Iowa
Kent State University
University of Kentucky
Long Island University
Louisiana State University
University of Missouri, Columbia
State University of New York, Albany
State University of New York at Buffalo
University of North Carolina
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
University of North Texas
Northern Illinois University
University of Oklahoma
University of Pittsburgh
Pratt Institute
Queens College, City University of New York
University of Rhode Island
Rosary College
San Jose State University
University of South Carolina
University of South Florida
Texas Woman's University
University of Washington
Wayne State University
University of Wisconsin-Madison
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

CANADA

University of Alberta
University of British Columbia
McGill University
Universite de Monreal
University of Toronto

IX. Bulletins Received from the Participants

- University of California, Berkeley. Library and Information Studies, 1989-90

- The University of British Columbia. School of Library, Archival and Information Studies; Master of Library Science Program and Master of Archival Studies Program, 1989/90

- The University of Iowa. Library and Information Science, 1984-1986

- Universite de Montreal. Ecole de bibliotheconomie et des sciences de l'information; Programme de 2e cycle: Maitrise en bibliotheconomie et sciences de l'information ou Maitrise en bibliotheconomie et sciences de l'inmformation, specialisation en archivistique; Programme de 1er cycle: Certificat en archivistique, 1990-1992.

- San Jose State University. Division of Library and Information Science Bulletin, 1989-1990.

- University of Toronto. Faculty of Library and Information Science Calendar, 1989-1990

- University of Washington. Graduate School of Library and Information Science, 1990-92

- The author also acknowledges with thanks receiving course syllabi from a numberv of participating institutions.

X. LIST OF TABLES

1. Distribution of Survey Questionnaire

2. Variations in Names of Schools

3. Variations in Titles of Masters Degrees

4. Variations in the Titles of Introductory Courses

5. Number of Instructors

6. Teaching Methodologies

7. Students Profile

8. Theory vs Practice Approaches

9 Course Evaluation

10. Revision of the Course Syllabus

XI. APPENDEXES

1. Sample Survey Questionnaire 43

2. Summary of U.S. and Canadian Responses to the Survey Questionnaire 51

3. Relative Priorities (AR) and Average Ratings (AR).. 56

4. Comparison of the Average Ratings among Five Curricular Categories 58

5. Degree of Concensus 60

6. Responses by Programatic Levels (US Only) 61

7. Comparison between US & Canadian Responses to the Questionnaire 76

Appendix 1. Sample Survey Questionnaire

a. Introductory Letter: March 1, 1990

Dear Colleague:

The faculty at SUNY-Albany School of Information Science and Policy is conducting a review of its introductory graduate course entitled 'The Information Environment' and your willingness to share with us your expertise in this matter would be sincerely appreciated.

The course currently addresses 'the evolving social, political, and institutional environments within which information services are and can be organized,' carries three credits, is required of all students, and is taught by different faculty members, each developing his or her own approach.

The sources of information provided by the participants in this study will be fully confidential; my purpose is not to evaluate programs of different graduate schools but to confirm the extent of consensus on the definition of the field, as it is expressed in the content of its introductory course.

I intend to publish the results of the study or make them available to the participants on request.

I hope that the results of this survey may also be of interest to you, and that you will be willing to assist me in gathering necessary information.

Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Joseph Z. Nitecki, Professor
School of Information Science
and Policy, SUNY at Albany

JN:kma
Enclosures

b. Follow-up Letter: April 19, 1990

Dear Colleague:

I am concerned that the survey questionnaire I mailed to you last March or your response to it might have been lost somewhere between our two universities.

Assuming that you are willing to participate in the study, I am forwarding another copy of the questionnaire to you. The survey focuses on the ways library and information science are defined in introductory courses to the field offered by all ALA accredited Graduate Library Education Programs. The usefulness of the study will be in part determined by the number of schools participating in this project. Hence your assistance in completing the enclosed questionnaire shall be sincerely appreciated.

Cordially,

Joseph Z. Nitecki
Professor

c. Survey Questionnaire

CONTENT OF THE INTRODUCTORY COURSE
IN LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE
[SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE]

NAME OF THE INSTITUTION _____

- Name of the contact person _____

- Course title _____

- Number of credits _____

- Required for graduation Yes/No

- Number of instructors teaching the course _____

- Teaching methodologies include:

  a. Lectures _____

  b. Independent student research _____

  c. Case studies _____

d. Team teaching _____

e. Use of A-V resources _____

f. Use of interactive media _____

g. Simulations _____

Other [Please explain] _____
_____

- Approximate percent of students registering for the course in their first semester _____

- The course is predominantly:

a. Theoretical _____

b. Practical _____

- Evaluation of the course is accomplished by:

a. Faculty self-evaluation _____

b. Students evaluation _____

c. Peer evaluation _____

d. Administrative evaluation _____

- Do you contemplate a major review of the course? _____

CHECKLIST

[Please circle priority: High [H], Medium [M], Low [L], Irrelevant [I]. If the topic is covered by a different course, please name the course. Your additional comments are solicited; please use separate page with references to relevant questions.]

TOPICS COVERED IN THE COURSE	PRIORITY	COVERED BY OTHER COURSE
A. CONCEPTS		
1. Definitions of Basic Concepts	H-M-L-I	
2. Philosophy of		
a. Information Science	H-M-L-I	
b. Library Science	H-M-L-I	
3. Theory of		
a. Information Science	H-M-L-I	
b. Library Science	H-M-L-I	
4. Major focus is on:		
a. Economics of Information	H-M-L-I	
b. Historical Aspects (evolving concepts)	H-M-L-I	
c. Psychological Aspects (information users)	H-M-L-I	
d. Sociological Aspects (society & culture)	H-M-L-I	
e. Technical Aspects (know-how)	H-M-L-I	
f. Others	H-M-L-I	

B. INFORMATION CONTENT, SOURCE & SERVICES

1. Archives	H-M-L-I	_____
2. Artificial Intelligence	H-M-L-I	_____
3. Automation	H-M-L-I	_____
4. Bibliography	H-M-L-I	_____
5. Cataloging	H-M-L-I	_____
6. Classification	H-M-L-I	_____
7. Bibliographic Instruction	H-M-L-I	_____
8. Comparative Librarianship	H-M-L-I	_____
9. Expert Systems	H-M-L-I	_____
10. Formats of Information Carriers (Print, Film, etc.)	H-M-L-I	_____
11. Information Retrieval	H-M-L-I	_____
12. Government Publications	H-M-L-I	_____
13. Management of Information	H-M-L-I	_____
14. Marketing	H-M-L-I	_____
15. Networks	H-M-L-I	_____
16. Personnel	H-M-L-I	_____
17. Public Relations	H-M-L-I	_____
18. Public Services	H-M-L-I	_____
19. Publishing	H-M-L-I	_____
20. Preservation and Conservation	H-M-L-I	_____
21. Rare Material	H-M-L-I	_____

22. Library, Types of
    a. College & University H-M-L-I _____
    b. Public Libraries H-M-L-I _____
    c. School Libraries H-M-L-I _____
    d. Children & Young Adults Libraries H-M-L-I _____
    e. Others H-M-L-I _____

23. User Category
    a. Children H-M-L-I _____
    b. Young Adults H-M-L-I _____
    c. Elderly H-M-L-I _____
    d. Business H-M-L-I _____
    e. Research H-M-L-I _____
    f. Others H-M-L-I _____

24. Technical Services H-M-L-I _____

25. Technology H-M-L-I _____

26. Others H-M-L-I _____

C. INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT

1. Censorship H-M-L-I _____
2. Communication H-M-L-I _____
3. Control of Information [Copyrights, etc.] H-M-L-I _____
4. Culture
    a. Popular Culture H-M-L-I _____
    b. Mass Media H-M-L-I _____
5. Environmental Factors H-M-L-I _____
6. Historical Background H-M-L-I _____
7. Information Policy H-M-L-I _____

8. Intellectual Freedom	H-M-L-I	_____
9. Legislation	H-M-L-I	_____
10. Organizational Structure	H-M-L-I	_____
11. Research	H-M-L-I	_____
12. Others	H-M-L-I	_____

D. INTERDISCIPLINARY RELATIONS:

1. Anthropology	H-M-L-I	_____
2. Business	H-M-L-I	_____
3. Communication	H-M-L-I	_____
4. Computer Science	H-M-L-I	_____
5. Economics	H-M-L-I	_____
6. Education	H-M-L-I	_____
7. Linguistics	H-M-L-I	_____
8. Mathematics	H-M-L-I	_____
9. Neurology	H-M-L-I	_____
10. Philosophy	H-M-L-I	_____
11. Psychology	H-M-L-I	_____
12. Public Administration	H-M-L-I	_____
13. Semiotics	H-M-L-I	_____
14. Statistics	H-M-L-I	_____
15. Systems	H-M-L-I	_____
16. Others	H-M-L-I	_____

E. PROFESSION

1. Concept of Profession	H-M-L-I	_____
2. Educational Programs	H-M-L-I	_____
3. Labor Relations	H-M-L-I	_____
4. Library & Information Agencies	H-M-L-I	_____
5. Professional Organizations	H-M-L-I	_____
6. Professional Ethics	H-M-L-I	_____
7. Specialization	H-M-L-I	_____
8. Others	H-M-L-I	_____

Please share copies of this questionnaire with other instructors teaching your introductory course. I would appreciate receiving any available descriptive material of the course (e.g., course syllabus, class assignments, bibliographies, catalog description, students handouts, etc.).

Please return this questionnaire not later than March 31, 1990 to:

J.Z. Nitecki
SUNY-ALBANY
School of Information
Science and Policy
135 Western Avenue
Draper 113
Albany, N.Y., 12222

[Self-addressed envelope enclosed]

Thank you again for your assistance.

Sincerely,

J.Z. Nitecki

Appendix 2: Summary of U.S. and Canadian Responses to the Survey Questionnaire

TOPICS COVERED		IDENTIFIED PRIORITY				
		N	H	M	L	I
		[Number of Responses]				
A. CONCEPTS						
1. Definitions of Basic Concepts	C	4	2	2	0	0
	US	26	21	4	1	0
	T	30	23	6	1	0
2. Philosophy of						
a. Information Science	C	4	2	0	2	0
	US	26	9	9	8	0
	T	30	11	9	10	0
b. Library Science	C	4	2	2	0	0
	US	27	16	8	3	0
	T	31	18	10	3	0
3. Theory of						
a. Information Science	C	4	2	0	2	0
	US	27	7	11	7	2
	T	31	9	11	9	2
b. Library Science	C	4	3	0	1	0
	US	26	12	10	4	0
	T	30	15	10	5	0
4. Major focus is on:						
a. Economics of Information	C	4	2	1	1	0
	US	29	4	15	9	1
	T	33	6	16	10	1
b. Historical Aspects (evolving concepts)	C	4	0	4	0	0
	US	30	12	14	4	0
	T	34	12	18	4	0
c. Psychological Aspects (information users)	C	4	1	2	1	0
	US	30	6	15	8	1
	T	34	7	17	9	1
d. Sociological Aspects (society & culture)	C	4	2	2	0	0
	US	30	17	11	2	0
	T	34	19	13	2	0
e. Technical Aspects (know-how)	C	3	0	2	1	0
	US	28	3	10	13	2
	T	31	3	12	14	2

B. INFORMATION CONTENT, SOURCE & SERVICES

1. Archives	C	3	0	1	2	0
	US	30	0	5	21	4
	T	33	0	6	23	4
2. Artificial Intelligence	C	2	0	0	1	1
	US	30	0	7	16	7
	T	32	0	7	17	8
3. Automation	C	3	0	1	2	0
	US	30	5	15	10	0
	T	33	5	16	12	0
4. Bibliography	C	2	0	1	1	0
	US	29	2	9	8	10
	T	31	2	10	9	10
5. Cataloging	C	2	0	1	0	1
	US	28	1	4	12	11
	T	30	1	5	12	12
6. Classification	C	2	0	1	0	1
	US	28	1	3	14	10
	T	30	1	4	14	11
7. Bibliographic Instruction	C	2	0	1	1	0
	US	30	2	3	14	11
	T	32	2	4	15	11
8. Comparative Librarianship	C	2	0	1	1	0
	US	30	1	7	14	8
	T	32	1	8	15	8
9. Expert Systems	C	2	0	1	1	0
	US	28	2	9	11	6
	T	30	2	10	12	6
10. Formats of Information Carriers (Print, Film, etc	C	2	0	0	2	0
	US	30	5	13	6	6
	T	32	5	13	8	6
11. Information Retrieval	C	2	0	2	0	0
	US	29	6	11	7	5
	T	31	6	13	7	5
12. Government Publications	C	2	0	0	1	1
	US	29	1	4	19	5
	T	31	1	4	20	6
13. Management of Information	C	2	0	2	0	0
	US	30	4	13	9	4
	T	32	4	15	9	4
14. Marketing	C	2	0	1	1	0
	US	30	2	8	13	7
	T	32	2	9	14	7

15. Networks	C	2	0	2	0	0
	US	30	4	11	10	5
	T	32	4	13	10	5
16. Personnel	C	2	0	2	0	0
	US	28	2	4	14	8
	T	30	2	6	14	8
17. Public Relations	C	3	0	2	1	0
	US	30	2	10	10	8
	T	33	2	12	11	8
18. Public Services	C	3	0	3	0	0
	US	30	6	10	9	5
	T	33	6	13	9	5
19. Publishing	C	3	0	2	1	0
	US	29	0	13	11	5
	T	32	0	15	12	5
20. Preservation and Conservation	C	2	0	2	0	0
	US	29	2	7	14	6
	T	31	2	9	14	6
21. Rare Material	C	2	0	1	1	0
	US	29	1	2	15	11
	T	31	1	3	16	11
22. Library, Types of						
a. College & University	C	3	1	1	1	0
	US	30	7	13	6	4
	T	33	8	14	7	4
b. Public Libraries	C	3	1	1	1	0
	US	30	6	14	6	4
	T	33	7	15	7	4
c. School Libraries	C	3	1	1	1	0
	US	30	5	14	7	4
	T	33	6	15	8	4
d. Children & Young Adults Libraries	C	3	1	1	1	0
	US	29	4	13	8	4
	T	32	5	14	9	4
23. User Category						
a. Children	C	3	0	1	2	0
	US	24	3	4	10	7
	T	27	3	5	12	7
b. Young Adults	C	3	0	1	2	0
	US	27	3	5	11	8
	T	30	3	6	13	8
c. Elderly	C	3	0	1	2	0
	US	27	3	4	12	8
	T	30	3	5	14	8
d. Business	C	3	0	1	2	0
	US	27	3	8	8	8
	T	30	3	9	10	8
e. Research	C	2	0	1	1	0
	US	27	3	9	7	8
	T	29	3	10	8	8

24. Technical Services	C	2	0	1	1	0
	US	27	2	3	14	8
	T	29	2	4	15	8
25. Technology	C	1	0	1	0	0
	US	26	6	13	5	2
	T	27	6	14	5	2
C. INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT						
1. Censorship	C	4	2	2	0	0
	US	30	15	10	4	1
	T	34	17	12	4	1
2. Communication	C	4	1	2	1	0
	US	30	15	12	3	0
	T	34	16	14	4	0
3. Control of Information [Copyrights, etc.]	C	4	1	3	0	0
	US	30	8	17	5	0
	T	34	9	20	5	0
4. Culture						
a. Popular Culture	C	4	0	2	2	0
	US	30	6	12	9	3
	T	34	6	14	11	3
b. Mass Media	C	4	0	4	0	0
	US	29	4	15	8	2
	T	33	4	19	8	2
5. Environmental Factors	C	3	1	2	0	0
	US	28	5	18	2	3
	T	31	6	20	2	3
6. Historical Background	C	4	0	4	0	0
	US	29	11	12	5	1
	T	33	11	16	5	1
7. Information Policy	C	4	2	2	0	0
	US	30	7	16	6	1
	T	34	9	18	6	1
8. Intellectual Freedom	C	4	2	2	0	0
	US	30	16	9	4	1
	T	34	18	11	4	1
9. Legislation	C	4	1	3	0	0
	US	30	4	15	9	2
	T	34	5	18	9	2
10. Organizational Structure	C	4	1	2	1	0
	US	29	4	13	9	3
	T	33	5	15	10	3
11. Research	C	4	1	2	1	0
	US	30	7	11	10	2
	T	34	8	13	11	2

D. INTERDISCIPLINARY RELATIONS:

1. Anthropology	C	3	0	0	2	1
	US	27		2	13	12
	T	30	0	2	15	13
2. Business	C	4	0	1	2	1
	US	27	0	7	8	12
	T	31	0	8	10	13
3. Communication	C	4	0	2	1	1
	US	27	2	11	6	8
	T	31	2	13	7	9
4. Computer Science	C	4	0	2	1	1
	US	27	2	7	11	7
	T	31	2	9	12	8
5. Economics	C	4	0	2	1	1
	US	27	2	7	9	9
	T	31	2	9	10	10
6. Education	C	4	0	2	1	1
	US	27	1	8	8	10
	T	31	1	10	9	11
7. Linguistics	C	4	0	2	1	1
	US	27	1	2.5	10.5	13
	T	31	1	4.5	11.5	14
8. Mathematics	C	3	0	1	1	1
	US	27	0	2.5	10.5	14
	T	30	0	3.5	11.5	15
9. Neurology	C	3	0	0	1	2
	US	27	0	1	9	17
	T	30	0	1	10	19
10. Philosophy	C	4	0	2	1	1
	US	27	2	2	10	13
	T	31	2	4	11	14
11. Psychology	C	4	0	2	1	1
	US	27	2	5.5	6.5	13
	T	31	2	7.5	7.5	14
12. Public Administration	C	4	0	2	1	1
	US	27	0	7	7	13
	T	31	0	9	8	14
13. Semiotics	C	3	0	1	1	1
	US	26	0	2	7	17
	T	29	0	3	8	18
14. Statistics	C	4	0	2	1	1
	US	27	1	2	10	14
	T	31	1	4	11	15
15. Systems	C	3	0	2	0	1
	US	27	0	8	7	12
	T	30	0	10	7	13

*

E. PROFESSION						
1. Concept of Profession	C	4	2	2	0	0
	US	30	19	10	0	1
	T	34	21	12	0	1
2. Educational Programs	C	4	0	3	1	0
	US	28	7	12	7	2
	T	32	7	15	8	2
3. Labor Relations	C	4	0	3	1	0
	US	30	6	6	14	4
	T	34	6	9	15	4
4. Library & Information Agencies	C	4	1	3	0	0
	US	29	14	10.5	2.5	2
	T	33	15	13.5	2.5	2
5. Professional Organizations	C	4	1	2	1	0
	US	30	14.5	11.5	2	2
	T	34	15.5	13.5	3	2
6. Professional Ethics	C	4	2	2	0	0
	US	30	17.5	8.5	3	1
	T	34	19.5	10.5	3	1
7. Specialization	C	4	1	2	1	0
	US	29	8	13	5	3
	T	33	9	15	6	3

Appendix 3: RELATIVE PRIORITIES [RP] and AVERAGE RATING [AR] OF INDIVIDUAL TOPICS
[Combined US & Canadian Institutions]

Topic	Relative Priorities (RP) [Percent of total]				Average Rating (AV) [Sum of Factors]
	H	M	L	I	
A: CONCEPTS					
A-1	76.6	20.0	3.3	0	2.73
A-2a	36.6	30.0	33.3	0	2.03
A-2b	58.0	32.2	9.7	0	2.52
A-3a	29.0	35.5	29.0	6.5	1.87
A-3b	50.0	33.3	16.7	0	2.33
A-4a	18.2	48.5	30.3	3.0	1.81
A-4b	35.3	52.9	11.8	0	2.23
A-4c	20.6	50.0	26.5	2.9	1.88
A-4d	55.9	38.2	5.9	0	2.50
A-4e	9.7	38.7	45.2	6.4	1.52

B: INFORMATION CONTENT
SOURCE & SERVICES

B-1	0	18.2	69.7	12.1	1.06
B-2	0	21.9	53.1	25.0	0.97
B-3	15.1	48.5	36.4	0	1.79
B-4	6.4	32.3	29.0	32.3	1.68
B-5	3.3	16.7	40.0	40.0	0.83
B-6	3.6	10.7	50.0	35.7	0.82
B-7	6.2	12.5	46.9	34.4	0.91
B-8	3.1	25.0	46.9	25.0	1.06
B-9	6.7	33.3	40.0	20.0	1.27
B-10	15.6	40.6	25.0	18.8	1.44
B-11	19.4	41.9	22.6	16.1	1.55
B-12	3.2	12.9	64.5	19.4	1.0
B-13	12.5	46.9	28.1	12.5	1.59
B-14	6.2	28.1	43.7	21.9	1.19
B-15	12.5	40.6	31.2	15.6	1.50
B-16	6.7	20.0	46.7	26.6	1.07
B-17	6.0	36.4	33.3	24.2	1.24
B-18	18.2	39.3	27.3	15.2	1.51
B-19	0	46.9	37.5	15.6	1.31
B-20	6.4	29.0	45.2	19.4	1.23
B-21	3.2	9.7	51.6	35.5	0.81
B-22a	24.2	42.4	21.2	12.1	1.79
B-22b	21.2	45.5	21.2	12.1	1.76
B-22c	18.2	45.5	24.2	12.1	1.70
B-22d	15.6	43.7	28.1	12.5	1.5
B-23a	11.1	18.5	44.4	25.9	1.15
B-23b	10.0	20.0	43.3	26.6	1.13
B-23c	10.0	16.7	46.7	26.6	1.10
B-23d	10.0	30.0	33.3	26.7	1.23
B-23e	10.3	34.5	27.6	27.6	1.28
B-24	6.8	13.8	51.7	27.6	1.0
B-25	22.2	51.9	18.5	7.4	1.89

C: INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT

C-1	50.0	35.3	11.8	2.9	2.32
C-2	47.1	41.2	11.7	0	2.32
C-3	26.5	58.8	14.7	0	2.12
C-4a	17.6	41.2	32.4	8.8	1.68
C-4b	12.1	57.6	24.2	6.0	1.76
C-5	19.4	64.5	6.4	9.7	1.94
C-6	33.3	48.5	15.2	3.0	2.12
C-7	26.5	52.9	17.6	2.9	2.03
C-8	52.9	32.4	11.8	2.9	2.35
C-9	14.7	52.9	26.5	5.9	1.76
C-10	15.2	45.5	30.3	9.0	1.67
C-11	23.5	38.2	32.4	5.9	1.79

D: INTERDISCIPLINARY RELATIONS					
D-1	0	6.7	50.0	43.3	0.63
D-2	0	25.8	32.3	41.9	0.84
D-3	6.5	41.9	22.6	29.0	1.26
D-4	6.5	29.0	38.7	25.8	1.16
D-5	6.5	29.0	32.2	32.2	1.10
D-6	3.2	32.3	29.0	35.5	1.03
D-7	3.2	14.5	37.0	45.2	0.76
D-8	0	11.7	38.3	50.0	0.62
D-9	0	3.3	33.3	63.3	0.4
D-10	6.5	12.9	35.5	45.1	0.81
D-11	6.5	24.2	24.2	45.1	0.92
D-12	0	29.0	25.8	45.2	0.84
D-13	0	10.3	27.6	62.1	0.48
D-14	3.2	12.9	35.5	48.4	0.71
D-15	0	33.3	23.3	43.3	0.90
E: PROFESSION					
E-1	61.8	35.3	0	2.9	2.56
E-2	21.9	46.9	25.0	6.2	1.84
E-3	17.6	26.5	44.1	11.8	1.5
E-4	45.5	40.9	7.6	6.0	2.33
E-5	48.3	38.3	6.7	6.7	2.25
E-6	57.4	30.9	8.8	2.9	2.43
E-7	27.3	45.5	18.2	9.0	1.9

Appendix 4: A Comparison of the Average Rating Distribution Among Curricular Categories

Average Rating	Concept A	Content B	Environment C	Eclecticism D	Profession E
Highest	2.73	1.79	2.35	1.26	2.56
Topic	A-1	B-3 B-22a	C-8	D-3	E-1
Lowest	1.52	0.81	1.67	0.4	1.5
Topic	A-4e	B-21	C-10	D-9	E-3

Appendix 4a: A Comparison of the Average Rating Distribution by Different Programs

Average Rating	PhD + Certificate + Masters Degree (L1)	Certificate + Master Degree (L2)	Masters Degree Only (L3)
Highest Topic	3.0 A-1	2.81 A-2b	2.61 A-1
Lowest Topic	0.72 D-1 D-9	0.11 D-9 D-13	0.28 D-9 D-12 D-13

Appendix 4b: Comparison of U.S. and Canadian Institutions Concensus on Average Rating

Range	U.S. AR	U.S. Topic	Canada AR	Canada Topic
Highest AR	2.57	E-1	2.50	E-1;A-1;A-2b;A-3b;A-4d; C-1,C-7,C-8,E-6
Lowest AR	0.41	D-9	0.33	D-9
Largest Difference between U.S. & Canadian Institutions:	AR: 1.0	Topic: B-16		
Smallest Difference	AR: 0.01		E-4	
Same Range	AR: 2.5		A-4d	

Appendix 4c: Range of Average Rating Differences:

Range	Number of Topics
1.0 - 0.6	5 Topics
0.59 - 0.5	11 Topics
0.49 - 0.4	12 Topics
0.39 - 0.3	6 Topics
0.29 - 0.2	17 Topics
0.19 - 0.1	15 Topics
0.09 - 0.01	9 Topics
Same Rating	1 Topic
Total	76 Topics

Appendix 5: Degree of Concensus on the hHighest Priority Topics

CATEGORY	Relative Priority (RP)			Average Rating (AR)	
	Topic	Priority	Value	Topic	Value
A. Overall [Table 3]					
	A-1	H	76.6	A-1	2.73 (H)*
	B-1	L	69.7	E-1	2.56 (H)
	B-12	L	64.5	A-2b	2.52 (H)
	C-5	M	64.5	A-4d	2.50 (H)
	D-9	i	63.3	A-3b	2.33 (H)
	C-3	M	58.8	C-1	2.32 (H)
B. Dimensions:					
- Concept	A-1	H	76.6	A-1	2.73 (H)
	A-2b	H	58.0	A-4d	2.50 (H)
	A-4d	H	55.9	A-4b	2.23 (M)
	A-4b	M	52.9	A-2a	2.03 (i)
	A-3b	H	50.0	A-4c	1.88 (M)
	A-4c	M	50.0	A-3a	1.87 (M)
- Content, etc					
	B-1	L	69.7	B-25	1.89 (M)
	B-12	L	64.5	B-3	1.79 (M)
	B-2	L	53.1	B-22a	1.79 (M)
	B-25	M	51.9	B-22b	1.76 (M)
	B-24	L	51.7	B-22c	1.70 (L)
	B-21	L	51.6	B-13	1.59 (M)
- Environment					
	C-5	M	64.5	C-8	2.35 (H)
	C-3	M	58.8	C-1	2.32 (H)
	C-4b	M	57.6	C-2	2.32 (H)
	C-8	H	52.9	C-3	2.12 (M)
	C-9	M	52.9	C-6	2.12 (M)
	C-6	M	48.5	C-7	2.03 (M)
- Disciplines					
	D-9	i	63.3	D-3	1.26 (M)
	D-13	i	62.1	D-4	1.16 (L)
	D-1	L	50.0	D-5	1.10 L/i)
	D-8	i	50.0	D-6	1.03 (i)
	D-14	i	48.4	D-11	0.92 (i)
	D-7	i	45.2	D-15	0.90 (i)
- Profession					
	E-1	H	61.8	E-1	2.56 (H)
	E-6	H	57.4	E-6	2.43 (H)
	E-5	H	48.3	E-4	2.33 (H)
	E-2	M	46.9	E-5	2.25 (H)
	E-4	H	45.5	E-7	1.9 (H)
	E-7	M	45.5	E-2	1.84 (M)

C. Programs

L1	A-1	H	100.0	A-1	3.0 (H)
	B-1	L	91.0		
	B-12	L	81.8		
	C-5	M	81.8		
	B-6	L	72.7		
	C-3	M	72.7		
	B-23d	i	71.4		
L2	D-13	i	88.9		
	D-9	i	88.9		
	C-4b	M	81.8		
L3					
	B-23c	i	71.4		

Appendix 6: Responses to Questionnaire by Programatic Levels [U.S. Only]

L1: - Doctorate + Certificate + Master Degrees Programs
L2: - Certificate + Master Degrees programs
L3: - Master Programs Only

QUESTION T O T A L A N S W E R S

F r e q u e n c y o f I d e n t i f i e d P r i o r i t i e s

	L	N	High	Medium	Low	Irrele-vant	Average Value
A: CONCEPTS							
A-1	1	8	8(100)	0	0	0	3.0
	2	10	7(70.0)	3(30.0)	0	0	2.70
	3	8	6(75.0)	1(12.5)	1((12.5)	0	2.62
A-2a	1	8	2(25.0)	4(50.o)	2(25.0)	0	2.0
	2	10	3(30.0)	5(50.0)	2(20.0)	0	2.01
	3	8	0	4(50.0)	4(50)	0	1.50
A-2b	1	8	4(50.0)	3(37.5)	1(12.5)	0	2.37
	2	11	9(81.8)	2(18.1)	0	0	2.81
	3	8	3(37.5)	3(37.5)	2(25.0)	0	2.12
A-3a	1	10	5(50.0)	4(40.0)	1(10.0)	0	2.40
	2	10	2(20.0)	5(50.0)	2(20.0)	1(10.0)	1.80
	3	7	0	2(28.6)	4(57.1)	1(14.3)	1.14

A-3b	1	8	5(62.5)	2(25.0)	1(12.5)	0	2.50
	2	11	5(45.5)	6(54.5)	0	0	2.45
	3	7	2(28.6)	2(28.6)	3(42.8)	0	1.85
A-4a	1	11	1(9.0)	8(72.7)	2(18.2)	0	1.90
	2	10	1(10.0)	3(30.0)	6(60.0)	0	1.80
	3	8	2(2.50)	4(50.0)	1(12.5)	1(12.5)	1.87
A-4b	1	11	4(36.5)	6(54.5)	1(9.0)	0	2.27
	2	11	5(45.5)	6(54.5)	0	0	2.45
	3	8	3(37.5)	2(25.0)	3(37.5)	0	2.00
A-4c	1	11	4(36.5)	6(54.5)	1(9.0)	0	2.27
	2	11	1(9.1)	6(54.5)	4(36.4)	0	1.72
	3	8	1(12.5)	3(37.5)	3(37.5)	1(1.25)	1.50
A-4d	1	11	5(45.5)	6(54.5)	0	0	2.45
	2	11	6(54.5)	4(36.4)	1(9.1)	0	2.45
	3	8	6(75.0)	1(12.5)	1(12.5)	0	2.62
A-4e	1	10	0	4(40.0)	6(60.0)	0	1.40
	2	10	1(10.0)	5(50.0)	3(30.0)	1(10.0)	1.60
	3	8	2(25.0)	1(12.5)	4(50.0)	1(12.5)	1.50
B: INFVORMATION CONTENT SOURCES & SERVICES							
B-1	1	11	0	1(9.0)	10(91.0)	0	1.09
	2	11	0	3(27.3)	7(63.6)	1(9.1)	1.18
	3	8	0	1(12.5)	4(50.0)	3(3.75)	0.75
B-2	1	11	0	4(36.4)	6(54.6)	1(9.0)	1.27
	2	11	0	2(18.2)	8(72.7)	1(9.1)	1.09
	3	8	0	1(12.5)	2(25.0)	5(52.5)	0.50
B-3	1	11	2((18.2)	7(63.6)	2((18.2)	0	2.00
	2	11	1(9.1)	4(36.4)	6(54.5)	0	1.54
	3	8	2(25.0)	4(50.0)	2(25.0)	0	2.00
B-4	1	11	0	5(45.4)	4(36.4)	2(18.2)	1.27
	2	10	1(10.0)	3(30.0)	4(40.0)	2(20.0)	1.30
	3	8	1(12.5)	1(12.5)	0	6(75.0)	0.62
B-5	1	11	0	3(27.3)	7(63.6)	1(9.0)	1.18
	2	10	0	1(10.0)	5(50.0)	4(40.0)	0.70
	3	7	1(14.3)	0	0	6(85.7)	0.42
B-6	1	11	0	2(18.2)	8(72.7)	1(9.0)	1.09
	2	10	0	1(10.0)	5(50.0)	4(40.0)	0.70
	3	7	1(14.3)	0	1(14.3)	5(71.4)	0.57

B-7	1	11	0	2(18.2)	7(63.6)	2(18.2)	1.00
	2	11	1(9.1)	1(9.1)	5(45.4)	4(36.4)	0.90
	3	8	1(12.5)	0	2(25.0)	5(62.5)	0.62
B-8	1	11	1(9.0)	1(9.0)	7(63.6)	2(18,2)	1.09
	2	11	0	5(45.4)	5(45.4)	1(9.1)	1.36
	3	8	0	1(12.5)	2(25.0)	5(62.5)	0.50
B-9	1	10	2(20.0)	6(60.0)	2(20.0)	0	2.00
	2	10	0	3(30.0)	4(40.0)	3(30.0)	1.00
	3	8	0	0	5(62.5)	3(37.5)	0.62
B-10	1	11	1(9.0)	6(54.6)	4(36.4)	0	1.81
	2	11	4(36.3)	3(27.3)	2(18.2)	2(18.2)	1.81
	3	8	0	4(50.0)	0	4(50.0)	1.00
B-11	1	11	2(18.2)	6(54.6)	2(18.2)	1(9.0)	1.81
	2	11	3(27.3)	3(27.3)	3(27.3)	2(18.1)	1.63
	3	7	1(14.3)	2(28.6)	2(28.6)	2(28.6)	1.28
B-12	1	11	1(9.1)	1(9.1)	9(81.8)	0	1.27
	2	10	0	2(20.0)	6(60.0)	2(20.0)	1.00
	3	8	0	1(12.5)	4(50.0)	3(37.5)	0.75
B-13	1	11	2(18.2)	5(45.4)	4(36.4)	0	1.81
	2	11	1(9.1)	5(45.5)	2(18.1)	3(27.3)	1.36
	3	8	1(12.5)	3(37.5)	3(37.5)	1(12.5)	1.09
B-14	1	11	0	4(36.3)	6(54.6)	1(9.0)	1.27
	2	11	1(9.1)	3(27.3)	4(36.3)	3(27.3)	1.18
	3	8	1(12.5)	1(12.5)	3(37.5)	3(37.5)	1.00
B-15	1	11	1(9.0)	4(36.4)	5(45.5)	1(9.0)	1.45
	2	11	2(18.2)	5(45.4)	2(18.2)	2(18.2)	1.63
	3	8	1(12.5)	2(25.0)	3(37.5)	2(25.0)	1.25
B-16	1	11	0	2(18.2)	6(54.5)	3(27.3)	0.90
	2	10	2(20.0)	2(20.0)	4(40.0)	2(20.0)	1.40
	3	7	0	0	4(57.1)	3(42.8)	0.57
B-17	1	11	0	4(36.4)	6(54.6)	1(9.0)	1.27
	2	11	1(9.1)	4(36.4)	3(27.2)	3(27.2)	1.27
	3	8	1(12.5)	2(15.0)	1(12.5)	4(50.0)	1.00
B-18	1	11	3(27.3)	4(36.4)	4(36.3)	0	1.90
	2	11	1(9.1)	5(45.4)	4(36.4)	1(9.1)	1.54
	3	8	2(25.0)	1(12.5)	1(12.5)	4(50.0)	1.12
B-19	1	11	0	5(45.4)	6(54.6)	0	1.45
	2	10	0	3(30.0)	5(50.0)	2(20.0)	1.1
	3	8	0	5(62.5)	0	3(37.5)	1.25

B-20	1	11	1(9.0)	3(27.3)	5(45.4)	2(18.2)	1.27
	2	10	1(10.0)	3(30.0)	5(50.0)	1(10.0)	1.40
	3	8	0	1(12.5)	4(50.0)	3(37.5)	0.75
B-21	1	11	0	0	9(81.8)	1(18.2)	0.81
	2	10	1(10.0)	1(10.0)	3(30.0)	5(50.0)	0.80
	3	8	0	1(12.5)	3(37.5)	4(50.0)	0.62
B-22a	1	11	2(18.2)	7(63.6)	2(18.2)	0	2.00
	2	11	4(36.4)	3(27.2)	3(27.2)	1(9.1)	1.90
	3	8	1(12.5)	3(37.5)	1(12.5)	3(37.5)	1.25
B-22b	1	11	2(18.2)	7(63.6)	2(18.2)	0	2.00
	2	11	3(27.2)	4(36.4)	3(27.2)	1(9.1)	1.81
	3	8	1(12.5)	3(37.5)	1(12.5)	3(37.5)	1.25
B-22c	1	11	1(9.0)	7(63.6)	3(27.3)	0	1.81
	2	11	3(27.2)	4(36.4)	3(27.2)	1(9.10	1.81
	3	8	1(12.5)	3(37.5)	1(12.5)	3(37.5)	1.62
B-22d	1	11	1(9.0)	6(54.6)	4(36.4)	0	1.72
	2	11	2(18.2)	5(45.4)	3(27.2)	1(9.1)	1.72
	3	7	1(14.3)	2(28.6)	1(14.3)	3(42.8)	1.14
B-23a	1	11	1(9.0)	2(18.2)	5(45.4)	3(27.3)	1.09
	2	7	1(14.3)	2(28.6)	4(57.1)	0	1.57
	3	6	1(16.6)	0	1(16.6)	4(66.7)	0.66
B-23b	1	11	1(9.0)	2(18.2)	5(45.4)	3(27.3)	1.09
	2	9	1(11.1)	3(33.3)	5(55.5)	0	1.55
	3	7	1(14.3)	1(14.3)	5(71.4)	0	1.42
B-23c	1	11	1(9.0)	2(18.2)	5(45.4)	3(27.3)	1.09
	2	9	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	6(66.7)	0	1.44
	3	7	1(14.3)	0	1(14.3)	5(71.4)	0.57
B-23d	1	11	1(9.0)	4(36.4)	3(27.3)	3(27.3)	1.27
	2	9	1(11.1)	4(44.4)	4(44.4)	0	1.66
	3	7	1(14.3)	0	1(14.3(	5(71.4)	0.57
B-23e	1	11	1(9.0)	5(45.4)	2(18.2)	3(27.3)	1.36
	2	9	1(11.1)	4(44.4)	3(33.3)	1(11.1)	1.27
	3	7	1(14.3)	0	2(28.6)	4(57.1)	0.74
B-24	1	11	1(9.0)	1(9.0)	7(63.6)	2(18.2)	1.09
	2	8	0	0	5(62.5)	3(37.5)	0.62
	3	8	1(12.5)	2(25.0)	2(25.0)	3(37.5)	1.12
B-25	1	11	3(27.3)	6(54.5)	2(18.2)	0	2.09
	2	8	1(12.5)	4(50.0)	2(25.0)	1(12.5)	1.62
	3	7	2(28.6)	3(42.8)	1(14.3)	1(14.3)	1.85

C. INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT

C-1	1	11	5(45.4)	4(36.4)	2(18.2)	0	2.27
	2	11	5(45.5)	4(36.3)	2(18.2)	0	2.27
	3	8	5(62.5)	2(25.0)	0	1(12.5)	2.12
C-2	1	11	5(45.5)	5(45.5)	1(9.0)	0	2.36
	2	11	7(63.6)	4(36.4)	0	0	2.63
	3	8	3(37.5)	3(37.5)	2(25.0)	0	2.12
C-3	1	11	3(27.3)	8(72.7)	0	0	2.27
	2	11	3(27.3)	7(63.6)	1(9.0)	0	2.18
	3	8	2(25.0)	2(25.0)	4(50.0)	0	1.75
C-4a	1	11	1(9.0)	4(36.4)	6(54.6)	0	1.54
	2	11	2(18.2)	7(63.6)	2(18.2)	0	2.00
	3	8	3(37.5)	1(12.5)	1(12.5)	3(37.5)	1.50
C-4b	1	11	1(9.0)	4(36.4)	6(54.6)	0	1.54
	2	11	1(9.1)	9(81.8)	1(9.1)	0	2.00
	3	7	2(28.6)	2(28.6)	1(14.2)	2(28.6)	1.57
C-5	1	11	3(27.3)	8(72.7)	0	0	2.45
	2	11	1(9.1)	9(81.8)	1(9.1)	0	2.00
	3	6	1(16.7)	1(16.7)	1(16.67)	3(50.0)	1.00
C-6	1	11	2(18.2)	7(63.6)	2(18.2)	0	2.00
	2	11	5(45.5)	5(45.5)	1(9.0)	0	2.36
	3	7	4(57.1)	0	2(28.6)	1(14.3)	2.00
C-7	1	11	2(18.2)	7(63.6)	2(18.2)	0	2.00
	2	11	3(27.3)	6(54.5)	2(18.2)	0	2.09
	3	8	2(25.0)	3(37.5)	2(25.0)	1(12.5)	1.75
C-8	1	11	5(45.4)	3(27.3)	3(27.3)	0	2.18
	2	11	7(63.6)	3(27.2)	1(9.1)	0	2.54
	3	8	4(50.00	3(37.5)	0	1(12.5)	2.25
C-9	1	11	2(18.2)	6(54.5)	3(27.3)	0	1.90
	2	11	2(18.2)	6(54.5)	3(27.3)	0	1.90
	3	8	0	3(37.5)	3(37.5)	2(25.0)	1.50
C-10	1	10	2(20.0)	5(50.0)	3(30.0)	0	1.90
	2	11	2(18.2)	5(45.5)	4(36.3)	0	1.81
	3	8	0	3(37.5)	2(25.0)	3(37.5)	1.0
C-11	1	11	3(27.2)	4(36.4)	4(36.4)	0	1.90
	2	11	1(9.1)	6(54.5)	4(36.4)	0	1.72
	3	8	3(37.5)	1(12.5)	2(25.0)	1(25.0)	1.62

INTERDISCIPLINARY
RELATIONBS

D-1	1	11	0	1(9.0)	6(54.6)	4(36.4)	0.72
	2	9	0	0	1(11.1)	8(88.9)	0.22
	3	7	0	1(14.3)	6(85.7)	0	1.14
D-2	1	11	0	4(36.4)	4(36.4)	3(27.2)	1.09
	2	9	0	1(11.1)	3(33.3)	5(55.5)	0.55
	3	7	0	2(28.6)	1(14.3)	4(57.1)	0.71
D-3	1	11	1(9.0)	6(54.6)	1(9.0)	3(27.3)	1.45
	2	9	0	4(44.4)	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	1.11
	3	7	1(14.3)	1(14.3)	3(42.8)	2(28.6)	1.14
D-4	1	11	1(9.0)	3(27.3)	4(36.4)	3(27.3)	1.18
	2	9	0	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	4(44.4)	0.88
	3	7	1(14.3)	1(14.3)	5(71.4)	0	1.42
D-5	1	11	0	5(45.4)	3(27.3)	3(27.3)	1.18
	2	9	0	1(11.1)	5(55.5)	3(33.30	0.77
	3	7	2(28.6)	1(14.3)	1(14.3)	3(42.8)	0.42
D-6	1	11	1(9.0)	3(27.3)	4(36.4)	3(27.3)	1.18
	2	9	0	4(44.4)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	1.22
	3	7	0	1(14.3)	1(14.3)	5(71.4)	0.42
D-7	1	11	1(9.0)	1.5(13.6)	5.5(50.0)	3(27.3)	0.77
	2	9	0	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	6(66.6)	0.44
	3	7	0	0	3(42.8)	4(57.1)	0.42
D-8	1	11	0	2.5(22.7)	4.5(40.9)	4(36.4)	0.86
	2	9	0	0	3(33.3)	6(66.6)	0.33
	3	7	0	0	3(42.8)	4(57.1)	0.42
D-9	1	11	0	1(9.0)	6(54.6)	4(36.4)	0.72
	2	9	0	0	1(11.1)	8(88.9)	0.11
	3	7	0	0	2(28.6)	5(71.4)	0.28
D-10	1	11	1(9.0)	2(18.2)	5(45.4)	3(27.3)	1.09
	2	9	0	0	3(33.3)	6(66.6)	0.33
	3	7	1(14.3)	0	2(28.6)	4(57.1)	0.74
D-11	1	11	1(9.0)	4.5(40.9)	2.5(22.7)	3(27.3)	1.31
	2	9	0	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	6(66.6)	0.44
	3	7	1(14.3)	0	2(28.6)	4(57.1)	0.71
D-12	1	11	0	4(36.4)	3(27.2)	4(36.4)	1.00
	2	9	0	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	4(44.40	0.88
	3	7	0	0	2(28.6)	5(71.4)	0.28

D-13	1	10	0	2(20.0)	4(40.0)	4(40.0)	0.80
	2	9	0	0	1(11.1)	8(88.9)	0.11
	3	7	0	0	2(28.6)	5(71.4)	0.28
D-14	1	11	0	1(9.0)	7(63.6)	3((27.3)	0.81
	2	9	0	1(11.1)	1(11.1)	7(77.7)	0.33
	3	7	1(14.3)	0	2(28.6)	4(57.1)	0.71
D-15	1	11	0	4(36.4)	4(36.4)	3(27.2)	1.09
	2	9	0	2(22.2)	2(22.2)	5(55.5)	0.66
	3	7	0	2(28.6)	1(14.3)	4(57.1)	0.71
PROFESSION							
E-1	1	11	5(45.4)	6(54.6)	0	0	2.45
	2	11	8(72.7)	3(27.3)	0	0	2.72
	3	8	6(75.0)	1(12.5)	0	1(12.5)	2.50
E-2	1	9	3(33.3)	4(44.4)	2(22.2)	0	2.1
	2	11	2(18.2)	6(54.5)	3(27.3)	0	1.90
	3	8	2(25.0)	2(25.0)	2(25.0)	2(25.0)	1.50
E-3	1	11	0	2(18.2)	7(63.6)	2(18.2)	1.00
	2	11	6(54.5)	2(18.2)	3(27.3)	0	2.63
	3	8	0	2(25.0)	4(50.0)	2(25.0)	1.00
E-4	1	11	7(63.6)	2.5(22.7)	0.5(4.6)	1(9.0)	2.40
	2	10	3(30.0)	6(60.0)	1(10.0)	0	2.20
	3	8	4(50.0)	2(25.0)	1(12.50)	1(12.50)	2.12
E-5	1	11	4.5(40.9)	5.5(50.0)	1(9.0)	0	2.31
	2	11	6(54.5)	5(45.5)	0	0	2.54
	3	8	4(50.0)	1(12.5)	1(12.5)	2(25.0)	1.87
E-6	1	11	5.5(50.0)	3.5(31.8)	2(18.2)	0	2.31
	2	11	7(63.6)	3(27.3)	1(9.1)	0	2.27
	3	8	5(62.5)	2(25.0)	0	1(12.50)	2.37
E-7	1	11	5(45.5)	5(45.5)	1(9.0)		2.36
	2	10	2(20.0)	6(60.0)	2(20.0)		1.80
	3	8	1(12.5)	2(25.0)	2(25.0)	3(37.50	1.12

6a. PROGRAM: U.S. - Doctorate + Certificate + Master Degrees

QUESTION T O T A L A N S W E R S

Frequency of Identified Priorities

	N	High	Medium	Low	Irrele-vant	Average Value
A: CONCEPTS						
A-1	9	8	1			2.77
A-2a	9	2	4			1.88
A-2b	9	4	4	1		2.33
A-3a	11	5	4	2		2.18
A-3b	9	5	2	2		2.33
A-4a	12	1	9	2		2.0
A-4b	12	4	7	1		2.25
A-4c	12	4	7	1		2.25
A-4d	12	5				2.41
A-4e	11		4	7		1.36
B:INFORMATION CONTENT SOURCE & SERVICES						
B-1	12		1	11		1.08
B-2	11		4	6	1	1.27
B-3	12	2	7	3		1.91
B-4	11		5	4	2	1.09
B-5	11		3	7	1	1.09
B-6	11		2	8	1	1.0
B-7	12		2	8	2	0.83
B-8	11	1	1	7	2	0.90
B-9	10	2	6	2		2.0
B-10	11	1	6	4		1.72
B-11	11	2	6	2	1	1.72
B-12	11	1	1	9		1.72
B-13	11	2	5	4		1.81
B-14	11		4	6	1	1.18
B-15	11	1	4	5	1	1.36
B-16	11		2	6	3	0.63
B-17	12		4	7	1	0.16
B-18	12	3	5	4		1.91
B-19	12	5	7			2.41
B-20	11	1	3	5	2	1.09
B-21	11			9	2	0.63

B-22a	12	2	7	3		1.91
B-22b	12	2	7	3		1.91
B-22c	12	1	7	4		1.75
B-22d	12	1	6	5		1.66
B-23a	12	1	2	6	3	0.83
B-23b	12	1	2	6	3	0.83
B-23c	12	1	2	6	3	0.83
B-23d	12	1	4	4	3	1.0
B-23e	12	1	6	2	3	1.16
B-24	11	1	1	7	2	0.90
B-25	11	3	6	2		2.09
C: INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT						
C-1	12	5	5	2		2.25
C-2	12	5	5	2		2.25
C-3	12	3	9			2.25
C-4a	12	1	4	7		1.50
C-4b	12	1	5	6		1.58
C-5	12	3	9			2.25
C-6	12	2	8	2		2.0
C-7	12	2	8	2		2.0
C-8	12	5	4	3		2.16
C-9	12	2	7	3		1.91
C-10	11	2	5	4		1.81
C-11	12	3	4	5		1.83
D: INTERDISCIPLINARY RELATIONS						
D-1	11		1	6	4	0.36
D-2	12		4	5	3	0.83
D-3	12	1	6	2	3	1.16
D-4	12	1	3	5	3	0.91
D-5	12		5	4	3	0.91
D-6	12	1	3	5	3	0.79
D-7	12	1	1.5	6.5	3	0.79
D-8	11		2.5	4.5	4	0.50
D-9	11		1	6	4	0.36
D-10	12	1	2	6	3	0.83
D-11	12	1	4.5	3.5	3	1.04
D-12	12		4	4	4	0.66
D-13	10		2	4	4	0.40
D-14	12		1	8	3	0.58
D-15	12		4	5	3	0.83
E: PROFESSION						
E-1	12	5	7			2.41
E-2	10	3	4	3		2.60
E-3	12		2	8	2	0.83
E-4	12	7	3.5	0.5	1	2.29
E-5	12	4.5	6.5	1		2.29
E-6	12	5.5	4.5	2		2.29
E-7	12	5	5	2		2.25

6b. PROGRAM: U.S. - Certificate + Master Degrees

QUESTION T O T A L A N S W E R S

Frequency of Identified Priorities

	N	High	Medium	Low	Irrele-vant	Average Value
A: CONCEPTS						
A-1	10	7	3			2.7
A-2a	10	3	5	2		2.1
A-2b	11	9	2			2.8
A-3a	10	2	5	2	1	1.7
A-3b	11	5	6			2.4
A-4a	10	1	3	6		1.5
A-4b	11	5	6			2.4
A-4c	11	1	6	4		1.7
A-4d	11	6	4	1		2.4
A-4e	10	1	5	3	1	1.5
B: INFORMATION CONTENT SOURCE & SERVICES						
B-1	11		3	7	1	1.09
B-2	11		2	8	1	1.0
B-3	11	1	4	6		1.5
B-4	10	1	3	4	2	1.1
B-5	10		1	5	4	0.3
B-6	10		1	5	4	0.3
B-7	11	1	1	5	4	0.5
B-8	11		5	5	1	1.2
B-9	10		3	4	3	0.7
B-10	11	4	3	2	2	1.6
B-11	11	3	3	3	2	1.45
B-12	10		2	6	2	0.8
B-13	11	1	5	2	3	1.9
B-14	11	1	3	4	3	0.9
B-15	11	2	5	2	2	1.45
B-16	10	2	2	4	2	1.2
B-17	11	1	4	3	3	1.0
B-18	11	1	5	4	1	1.45
B-19	10		3	5	2	0.9
B-20	10	1	3	5	1	1.3
B-21	10	1	1	3	5	0.3

B-22a	11	4	3	3	1	1.8
B-22b	11	3	4	3	1	1.7
B-22c	11	3	4	3	1	1.7
B-22d	11	2	5	3	1	1.1
B-23a	7	1	2	4		1.5
B-23b	9	1	3	5		0.4
B-23c	9	1	2	6		1.4
B-23d	9	1	4	4		1.6
B-23e	9	1	4	3	1	1.4
B-24	8			5	3	0.4
B-25	8	1	4	2	1	1.5
C: INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT						
C-1	11	5	4	2		2.2
C-2	11	7	4			2.6
C-3	11	3	7	1		2.7
C-4a	11	2	7	2		2.0
C-4b	11	1	9	1		2.0
C-5	11	1	9	1		2.0
C-6	11	5	5	1		2.3
C-7	11	3	6	2		2.09
C-8	11	7	3	1		2.5
C-9	11	2	6	3		1.9
C-10	11	2	5	4		1.8
C-11	11	1	6	4		1.7
D: INTERDISCIPLINARY RELATIONS						
D-1	9			1	8	-0.7
D-2	9		1	3	5	0
D-3	9		4	2	3	0.7
D-4	9		3	2	4	0.4
D-5	9		1	5	3	0.4
D-6	9		4	3	2	1.0
D-7	9		1	2	6	-0.2
D-8	9			3	6	-0.3
D-9	9			1	8	-0.7
D-10	9			3	6	-0.3
D-11	9		1	2	6	-0.2
D-12	9		3	2	4	0.4
D-13	9			1	8	-0.7
D-14	9		1	1	7	-0.4
D-15	9		2	2	5	0.1
E: PROFESSION						
E-1	11	8	3	3		2.7
E-2	11	2	6	3		1.9
E-3	11	6	2	3		2.8
E-4	10	3	6	1		2.8
E-5	11	6	5			2.5
E-6	11	7	3	1		2.5
E-7	10	2	6	2		2.0

6c. PROGRAM: U.S. & Canada: Master Degrees Only

QUESTION T O T A L A N S W E R S

Frequency of Identified Priorities

	N	High	Medium	Low	Irrele-vant	Average Value
A: CONCEPTS						
A-1	11	8	2	1		2.63
A-2a	11	2	4	5		1.72
A-2b	11	5	4	2		2.27
A-3a	10	2	2	5	1	1.40
A-3b	10	5	2	3		2.80
A-4a	11	4	4	2	1	1.90
A-4b	11	3	5	3		2.54
A-4c	11	2	4	4	1	1.54
A-4d	11	8	2	1		2.63
A-4e	10	2	3	4	1	1.50
B:INFORMATION CONTENT SOURCE & SERVICES						
B-1	10		2	5	3	0.6
B-2	10		1	3	6	-0.1
B-3	10	2	5	3		1.9
B-4	10	1	2	1	6	0.8
B-5	9	1	1		7	0.22
B-6	9	1	1	1	6	0
B-7	10	1	1	3	5	0.3
B-8	10		2	3	5	0.2
B-9	10		1	6	3	0.5
B-10	10		4	2	4	0.6
B-11	9	1	4	2	2	1.22
B-12	10		1	5	4	0.3
B-13	10	1	5	3	1	1.5
B-14	10	1	2	4	3	1.0
B-15	10	1	4	3	2	1.2
B-16	9		2	4	3	0.55
B-17	10	2	3	1	4	0.9
B-18	10	2	3	1	4	0.9
B-19	10		6	1	3	1.0
B-20	10		3	4	3	0.7
B-21	10		2	4	4	0.4

B-22a	10	2	4	1	3	1.2
B-22b	10	2	4	1	3	1.2
B-22c	10	2	4	1	3	1.2
B-22d	9	2	3	1	3	1.11
B-23a	8	1	1	2	4	0.37
B-23b	9	1	1	2	5	0.22
B-23c	9	1	1	2	5	0.22
B-23d	9	1	1	2	5	0.22
B-23e	9	1	1	3	4	0.44
B-24	10	1	3	3	3	0.9
B-25	8	2	4	1	1	1.75
C: INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT						
C-1	11	7	3		1	2.36
C-2	11	4	5	2		2.18
C-3	11	3	4	4		1.90
C-4a	11	3	3	2	3	1.27
C-4b	10	2	5	1	2	1.5
C-5	8	2	2	1	3	1.0
C-6	10	4	2	2	1	1.9
C-7	11	4	4	2	1	1.9
C-8	11	6	4		1	2.27
C-9	11	1	5	3	2	1.27
C-10	11	1	5	2	3	1.09
C-11	11	4	3	2	2	1.63
D: INTERDISCIPLINARY RELATIONS						
D-1	10		1	8	1	0.9
D-2	10		3	2	5	0.3
D-3	10	1	3	3	3	0.9
D-4	10	1	3	5	1	1.3
D-5	10	2	3	1	4	0.9
D-6	10		3	1	6	0.1
D-7	10		2	3	5	0.2
D-8	10		1	4	5	0.1
D-9	10			3	7	-0.4
D-10	10	1	2	2	5	0.4
D-11	10	1	2	2	5	0.4
D-12	10		2	2	6	0
D-13	10		1	3	6	-0.1
D-14	10	1	2	2	5	0.4
D-15	10		4	1	5	0.4
E: PROFESSION						
E-1	11	8	2			2.4
E-2	11	2	5	2	2	1.4
E-3	11		5	4	2	1.09
E-4	11	5	4	1	1	2.09
E-5	11	5	3	1	2	1.8
E-6	11	7	3	1		2.5
E-7	11	2	4	2	3	1.18

6d. PROGRAM: Canada - All Programs

QUESTION	T O T A L	A N S W E R S				
F r e q u e n c y o f I d e n t i f i e d P r i o r i t i e s						
	N	High	Medium	Low	Irrele-vant	Average Value
A: CONCEPTS						
A-1	4	2	2			2.5
A-2a	4	2		2		2.0
A-2b	4	2	2			2.5
A-3a	4	2		2		2.0
A-3b	4	3		1		2.5
A-4a	4	2	1	1		2.25
A-4b	4		4			2.0
A-4c	4	1	2	1		2.0
A-4d	4	2	2			2.5
A-4e	3		2	1		1.66
B:INFORMATION CONTENT SOURCE & SERVICES						
B-1	3		1	2		1.33
B-2	2			1	1	0
B-3	3		1	2		1.33
B-4	2		1	1		1.5
B-5	2		1		1	0.5
B-6	2		1		1	0.5
B-7	2		1	1		1.5
B-8	2		1	1		1.5
B-9	2		1	1		1.5
B-10	2			2		1.0
B-11	2		2			2.0
B-12	2			1	1	0
B-13	2		2			2.0
B-14	2		1	1		1.5
B-15	2		2			2.0
B-16	2		2			2.0
B-17	3		2	1		1.66
B-18	3		3			2.0
B-19	3		2	1		1.66
B-20	2		2			2.0
B-21	2		1	1		1.5
B-22a	3	1	1	1		2.0
B-22b	3	1	1	1		2.0
B-22c	3	1	1	1		2.0
B-22d	3	1	1	1		2.0

B-23a	3		1	2	1.33
B-23b	3		1	2	1.33
B-23c	3		1	2	1.33
B-23d	3		1	2	1.33
B-23e	2		1	1	1.5
B-24	2		1	1	1.5
B-25	1		1		2.0
C: INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT					
C-1	4	2	2		2.5
C-2	4	1	2	1	2.0
C-3	4	1	3		2.25
C-4a	4		2	2	1.5
C-4b	4		4		2.0
C-5	3	1	2		2.33
C-6	4		4		2.0
C-7	4	2	2		2.5
C-8	4	2	2		2.5
C-9	4	1	3		2.25
C-10	4	1	2	1	2.0
C-11	4	1	2	1	2.0
D: INTERDISCIPLINARY RELATIONS					
D-1	3			2	1	0.33
D-2	4		1	2	1	0.75
D-3	4		2	1	1	1.0
D-4	4		2	1	1	1.0
D-5	4		2	1	1	1.0
D-6	4		2	1	1	1.0
D-7	4		2	1	1	1.0
D-8	3		1	1	1	0.66
D-9	3			1	2	-0.33
D-10	4		2	1	1	1.0
D-11	4		2	1	1	1.0
D-12	4		2	1	1	1.0
D-13	3		1	1	1	0.66
D-14	4		2	1	1	1.0
D-15	3		2		1	1.0
E: PROFESSION					
E-1	4	2	2		2.5
E-2	4		3	1	1.75
E-3	4		3	1	1.75
E-4	4	1	3		2.25
E-5	4	1	2	1	2.0
E-6	4	2	2		2.5
E-7	4	1	2	1	2.0

Appendix 7: Comparison between U.S. and Canadian Average Respsonses to the Survey Questinnaire
(Percents of Total)
C:- All Canadian answers combined
US:- All US answers combined
D:- Difference in responses

QUESTION		N	H	M	L	i
A: CONCEPTS						
A-1	C	4	50.0	50.0	0	0
	US :	26	73.1	15.4	3.8	0
	D		23.1	34.6	3.8	0
A-2a	C	4	50.0	0	50.0	0
	US	26	34.6	34.6	30.8	0
	D		15.4	34.6	19.2	0
A-2b	C	4	50.0	50.0	0	0
	US	27	59.3	29.6	11.1	0
	D		9.3	20.4	11.1	0
A-3a	C	4	50.0	0	50.0	0
	US	27	25.9	40.7	25.9	7.4
	D		24.1	40.7	24.1	7.4
A-3b	C	4	0.75	0	0.25	
	US	26	46.1	38.5	15.4	0
	D		45.35	38.5	15.15	0
A-4a	C	4	50.0	25.0	25.0	0
	US	29	13.8	51.7	31.0	3.4
	D		36.2	26.7	6.0	3.4
A-4b	C	4	0	100.0	0	0
	US	30	40.0	46.7	13.3	0
	D		40.0	53.3	13.3	0
A-4c	C	4	25.0	50.0	25.0	0
	US	30	20.0	50.0	26.7	3.3
	D		5.0	0	1.7	3.3
A-4d	C	4	50.0	50.0	0	0
	US	30	56.7	36.7	6.7	0
	D		6.7	13.3	6.7	0
A-4e	C	3	0	66.7	33.3	0
	US	28	10.7	10.7	46.4	7.1
	D		10.7	56.0	13.1	7.1

B: INFORMATION CONTENT
SOURCE & SERVICES

B-1	C	3	0	33.3	66.6	0
	US	30	0	16.6	70.0	13.3
	D		0	16.7	3.4	13.3
B-2	C	2	0	0	50.0	50.0
	US	30	0	23.3	53.3	23.3
	D		0	23.3	3.3	26.7
B-3	C	3	0	33.3	66.6	0
	US	30	16.7	50.0	33.3	0
	D		16.7	16.7	33.3	0
B-4	C	2	0	50.0	50.0	0
	US	29	6.9	31.0	27.5	34.5
	D		6.9	19.0	22.5	34.5
B-5	C	2	0	50.0	0	50.0
	US	28	3.6	14.3	42.9	39.2
	D		3.6	35.7	42.0	10.8
B-6	C	2	0	50.0	0	50.0
	US	28	3.6	10.7	50.0	35.7
	D		3.6	39.3	50.0	14.3
B-7	C	2	0	50.0	50.0	0
	US	30	6.7	10.0	46.7	36.6
	D		6.7	40.0	3.3	36.6
B-8	C	2	0	50.0	50.0	0
	US	30	3.3	23.3	46.7	26.7
	D		3.3	26.7	3.3	26.7
B-9	C	2	0	50.0	50.0	0
	US	28	7.1	32.1	39.3	21.4
	D		7.1	17.9	10.7	21.4
B-10	C	2	0	0	100.0	0
	US	30	16.7	43.3	20.0	20.0
	D		16.7	43.3	80.0	20.0
B-11	C	2	0	100.0	0	0
	US	29	20.7	37.9	24.1	17.2
	D		20.7	62.1	24.1	17.2
B-12	C	2	0	0	50.0	50.0
	US	29	3.4	13.8	65.5	17.2
	D		3.4	13.8	15.5	32.8
B-13	C	2	0	100.0	0	0
	US	30	13.3	43.3	30.0	13.3
	D		13.3	56.7	30.0	13.3
B-14	C	2	0	50.0	50.0	0
	US	30	6.7	26.6	43.3	23.3
	D		6.7	23.4	6.7	23.3
B-15	C	2	0	100.0	0	0
	US	30	13.3	36.7	33.3	16.7
	D		13.3	63.3	33.3	16.7
B-16	C	2	0	100.0	0	0
	US	28	7.1	14.3	50.0	28.6
	D		7.1	85.7	50.0	28.6

B-17	C	3	0	66.7	33.3	0
	US	30	6.7	33.3	33.3	26.7
	D		6.7	33.4	0	26.7
B-18	C	3	0	100.0	0	0
	US	30	20.0	33.3	30.0	16.7
	D		20.0	66.7	30.0	16.7
B-19	C	3	0	66.7	33.3	0
	US	29	0	44.8	37.9	17.2
	D		0	21.9	4.6	17.2
B-20	C	2	0	100.0	0	0
	US	29	6.9	24.1	48.3	20.7
	D		6.9	75.9	48.3	20.7
B-21	C	2	0	50.0	50.0	0
	US	29	3.4	6.9	51.7	37.9
	D		3.4	43.1	1.7	37.9
B-22a	C	3	33.3	33.3	33.3	0
	US	30	23.3	43.3	20.0	13.3
	D		10.0	10.0	13.3	13.3
B-22b	C	3	33.3	33.3	33.3	0
	US	30	20.0	46.7	20.0	13.3
	D		13.3	13.4	13.3	13.3
B-22c	C	3	33.3	33.3	33.3	0
	US	30	16.7	46.7	23.3	13.3
	D		16.6	13.4	10.0	13.3
B-22d	C	3	33.3	33.3	33.3	0
	US	29	13.8	44.8	27.6	13.8
	D		19.5	11.5	5.7	13.8
B-23a	C	3	0	33.3	66.7	0
	US	24	12.5	16.7	41.7	29.2
	D		12.5	31.6	25.0	29.2
B-23b	C	3	0	33.3	66.7	0
	US	27	11.1	18.5	40.7	29.6
	D		11.1	14.8	26.0	29.6
B-23c	C	3	0	33.3	66.6	0
	US	27	11.1	14.8	44.4	29.6
	D		11.1	18.5	22.2	29.6
B-23d	C	3	0	33.3	66.6	0
	US	27	11.1	29.6	29.6	29.6
	D		11.1	3.7	37.0	29.6
B-23e	C	2	0	50.0	50.0	0
	US	27	11.1	33.3	25.9	29.6
	D		11.1	16.7	24.1	29.6
B-24	C	2	0	50.0	50.0	0
	US	27	7.4	11.1	51.8	29.6
	D		7.4	38.9	1.8	29.6
B-25	C	1	0	100.0	0	0
	US	26	23.1	50.0	19.2	7.7
	D		23.1	50.0	19.2	7.7

C: INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT

C-1	C	4	50.0	50.0	0	0
	US	30	50.0	33.3	13.3	3.3
	D		0	16.7	13.3	3.3
C-2	C	4	25.0	50.0	25.0	0
	US	30	50.0	40.0	10.0	0
	D		25.0	10.0	15.0	0
C-3	C	4	25.0	75.0	0	0
	US	30	26.7	56.7	16.6	0
	D		1.7	18.3	16.6	0
C-4a	C	4	0	50.0	50.0	0
	US	30	20.0	40.0	30.0	10.0
	D		20.0	10.0	20.0	10.0
C-4b	C	4	0	100.0	0	0
	US	29	13.8	50.0	26.7	6.7
	D		13.8	50.0	26.7	6.7
C-5	C	3	33.3	66.6	0	0
	US	28	17.9	64.2	7.1	10.7
	D		15.4	2.4	7.1	10.7
C-6	C	4	0	100.0	0	0
	US	29	37.9	41.4	17.2	3.4
	D		37.9	58.6	17.2	3.4
C-7	C	4	50.0	50.0	0	0
	US	30	23.3	53.3	20.0	3.33
	D		26.7	3.3	20.0	3.33
C-8	C	4	50.0	50.0	0	0
	US	30	53.3	30.0	13.3	3.33
	D		3.3	20.0	13.3	3.33
C-9	C	4	25.0	75.0	0	0
	US	30	13.3	50.0	30.0	6.6
	D		11.7	25.0	30.0	6.6
C-10	C	4	25.0	50.0	25.9	0
	US	29	13.8	44.8	31.0	10.3
	D		11.2	5.2	5.1	10.3
C-11	C	4	25.0	75.0	0	0
	US	30	23.3	36.7	33.3	6.7
	D		1.7	38.3	33.3	6.7

D: INTERDISCIPLINARY RELATIONS

D-1	C	3	0	0	66.7	33.3
	US	27	0	7.4	48.1	44.4
	D		0	7.4	18.6	11.1
D-2	C	4	0	25.0	50.0	25.0
	US	27	0	25.9	29.6	44.4
	D		0	0.9	20.4	19.4
D-3	C	4	0	50.0	25.0	25.0
	US	27	7.4	40.7	22.2	29.6
	D		7.4	9.3	2.8	9.6

D-4	C	4	0	50.0	25.0	25.0
	US	27	7.4	25.9	40.7	25.9
	D		7.4	24.1	15.7	0.9
D-5	C	4	0	50.0	25.0	25.0
	US	27	7.4	25.9	33.3	33.3
	D		7.4	24.1	8.3	8.3
D-6	C	4	0	50.0	25.0	25.0
	US	27	3.7	29.6	29.6	37.0
	D		3.7	20.4	4.6	12.0
D-7	C	4	0	50.0	25.0	25.0
	US	27	3.7	9.3	38.9	48.1
	D		3.7	40.7	13.9	23.1
D-8	C	3	0	33.3	33.3	33.3
	US	27	0	9.3	38.9	51.8
	D		0	24.0	5.6	18.5
D-9	C	3	0	0	33.3	66.6
	US	27	0	3.7	33.3	62.9
	D		0	3.7	0	3.7
D-10	C	4	0	50.0	25.0	25.0
	US	27	7.4	7.4	37.0	48.1
	D		7.4	42.6	12.0	23.1
D-11	C	4	0	50.0	25.0	25.0
	US	27	7.4	20.4	24.1	48.1
	D		7.4	29.6	5.9	23.1
D-12	C	4	0	50.0	25.0	25.0
	US	27	0	25.9	25.9	48.1
	D		0	24.1	0.9	23.1
D-13	C	3	0	33.3	33.3	33.3
	US	26	0	7.7	26.9	65.4
	D		0	25.6	6.4	32.1
D-14	C	4	0	50.0	25.0	25.0
	US	27	3.7	7.4	37.0	51.9
	D		3.7	42.6	12.0	26.9
D-15	C	3	0	66.7	0	33.3
	US	27	0	29.6	25.9	44.4
	D		0	37.1	25.9	11.1

E: PROFESSION

E-1	C	4	50.0	50.0	0	0
	US	30	63.3	33.3	0	3.3
	D		6.7	6.7	0	3.3
E-2	C	4	0	75.0	25.0	0
	US	28	25.0	42.9	25.0	7.1
	D		25.0	33.0	0	7.1
E-3	C	4	0	75.0	25.0	0
	US	30	20.0	20.0	46.7	13.3
	D		20.0	50.0	21.7	13.3
E-4	C	4	25.0	75.0	0	0
	US	29	48.3	36.2	8.6	6.9
	D		23.3	38.3	8.6	6.9
E-5	C	4	25.0	50.0	25.0	0
	US	30	48.3	38.3	6.7	6.7
	D		23.3	11.7	18.3	6.7
E-6	C	4	50.0	50.0	0	0
	US	30	58.3	28.3	10.0	3.3
	D		8.3	21.7	10.0	3.3
E-7	C	4	25.0	50.0	25.0	0
	US	29	27.6	44.8	17.2	10.3
	D		2.6	5.2	7.8	10.3

Appendix 7a: Comparison between U.S. and Canadian Average Ratings to the Survey Questinnaire [All Levels]

QUESTION	U.S.	CANADA	DIFFERENCE
A: CONCEPTS			
A-1	2.53	2.5	0.03
A-2a	2.04	2.0	0.04
A-2b	2.48	2.5	0.02
A-3a	1.85	2.0	0.15
A-3b	2.30	2.5	0.20
A-4a	1.76	2.25	0.49
A-4b	2.26	2.0	0.26
A-4c	1.86	2.0	0.14
A-4d	2.5	2.5	0
A-4e	1.50	1.66	0.16

B: INFORMATION CONTENT SOURCE & SERVICES			
B-1	1.03	1.33	0.3
B-2	1.0	0.5	0.5
B-3	1.83	1.33	0.5
B-4	1.10	1.5	0.4
B-5	0.82	1.0	0.18
B-6	0.82	1.0	0.18
B-7	0.87	1.5	0.63
B-8	1.03	1.5	0.47
B-9	1.25	1.5	0.25
B-10	1.57	1.0	0.57
B-11	1.62	2.0	0.38
B-12	1.03	0.5	0.53
B-13	1.57	2.0	0.43
B-14	1.17	1.5	0.33
B-15	1.47	2.0	0.53
B-16	1.0	2.0	1.0
B-17	1.2	1.66	0.46
B-18	1.57	2.0	0.43
B-19	1.27	1.67	0.4
B-20	1.17	2.0	0.83
B-21	0.76	1.5	0.74
B-22a	1.77	2.0	0.23
B-22b	1.73	2.0	0.27
B-22c	1.67	2.0	0.33
B-22d	1.59	2.0	0.41
B-23a	1.13	1.33	0.2
B-23b	1.11	1.33	0.22
B-23c	1.07	1.33	0.26
B-23d	1.22	1.33	0.11
B-23e	1.26	1.5	0.24
B-24	0.96	1.5	0.54
B-25	1.88	2.0	0.12
C: INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT			
C-1	2.3	2.5	0.2
C-2	2.4	2.0	0.4
C-3	2.1	2.25	0.15
C-4a	1.7	1.5	0.2
C-4b	1.72	2.0	0.28
C-5	1.89	2.33	0.44
C-6	2.14	2.0	0.14
C-7	1.97	2.5	0.53
C-8	2.34	2.5	0.16
C-9	1.70	2.25	0.55
C-10	1.62	2.0	0.38
C-11	1.77	2.0	0.23

D: INTERDISCIPLINARY RELATIONS			
D-1	0.63	0.66	0.03
D-2	0.81	1.0	0.19
D-3	1.26	1.25	0.01
D-4	1.15	1.25	0.1
D-5	1.07	1.25	0.18
D-6	1.0	1.25	0.25
D-7	0.69	1.25	0.56
D-8	0.57	1.0	0.43
D-9	0.41	0.33	0.08
D-10	0.74	1.25	0.51
D-11	0.87	1.25	0.38
D-12	0.78	1.25	0.47
D-13	0.42	1.0	0.58
D-14	0.63	1.25	0.62
D-15	0.85	1.34	0.49
E: PROFESSION			
E-1	2.57	2.50	0.07
E-2	1.86	1.75	0.11
E-3	1.47	1.75	0.28
E-4	2.26	2.25	0.01
E-5	2.28	2.0	0.28
E-6	0.42	2.5	0.08
E-7	1.90	2.0	0.10